

# **Harbury Cement Works Masterplan**

## **Supplementary Planning Document**

### **Statement of Consultation**

# **Contents**

Introduction	1
List of organisations contacted during consultation exercise	Appendix 1
List of agents contacted during consultation exercise	Appendix 2
Schedule of representations received and Council's response	Appendix 3

## Introduction

- 1.1 The redevelopment of the site has attracted a lot of concern amongst local people and interested stakeholders in the past. In this regard, it was felt that the process for the preparation of the Masterplan would be equally important as its outcome. A comprehensive stakeholder approach to consultation based on a series of workshops was adopted to involve all interested parties right from the beginning of the process.
- 1.2 An important and integral part of the process of preparing the Masterplan is the extent of local involvement at all stages of the process, including the identification of key issues about the redevelopment of the site that matter to local residents and other interested parties.
- 1.3 The Masterplan is informed by a large body of stakeholders including local Parish, District and County Councillors, community groups, the landowner and their consultants, statutory organisations, environmental groups, the County Council and other interested parties specifically formed to advise on each stage of the process. The list of stakeholders include:
  - Bishops Itchington Parish Council;
  - Butterfly Conservation Society;
  - Campaign to Protect Rural England;
  - Coventry and Warwickshire Chamber of Commerce;
  - Natural England;
  - Follett Property Limited;
  - Greenhill Residents Company;
  - Harbury Parish Council;
  - Harbury News;
  - Harbury Parish Paths Partnership;
  - Harbury Society
  - Highways Agency;
  - Ladbroke Parish Council;
  - RPS (Planning Consultants for the landowner);
  - Ufton Parish Council;
  - Warwickshire County Council;
  - Warwickshire Rural Community Council;
  - Warwickshire Wildlife Trust.

A series of site visits were also organised for stakeholders to gain a full understanding of the issues involved and how development would look on the ground. Furthermore, it was important that all the stakeholders had a full appreciation of the environmental assets of the site.

- 1.4 The principle of this approach to preparing the Masterplan is that the early involvement of all the stakeholders would help enrich the evidence base for the Masterplan and create a shared sense of ownership. Care was taken to ensure that the process for its preparation was fair, transparent, well researched and sufficiently informed by the collective advice of all the stakeholders. Furthermore, all the statutory bodies, the County Council, Ward Members and the landowner were given the opportunity to comment on the Draft Masterplan and their comments taken into account before it went out for full public consultation.
- 1.5 The general public and other various groups and organisations representing a wide range of interested parties such as developers, housing associations and residents groups were also given an opportunity and sufficient time to comment on the Draft Masterplan. These organisations and groups were directly consulted. Letters were sent to over 1000 consultees on the Council's community consultation database inviting comments on the Draft Supplementary Planning Document (SPD). A full list of the

organisations and individuals contacted during the consultation exercise is attached as Appendix 1. Also, a full list of Agents contacted during the consultation period is included in Appendix 2.

- 1.6 The publication of the document was advertised in two local papers inviting comments from the general public. The consultation period lasted six weeks between 30 August 2007 and 11 October 2007.
- 1.7 The contents of the Draft document were put on the Council's website.
- 1.8 Copies of the document were put on deposit at various Council offices and libraries.
- 1.9 A comprehensive schedule of representations received together with the Council's response and recommended course of action is attached as Appendix 3.
- 1.10 During the consultation period, face to face meetings were held with Harbury, Bishops Itchington, Ufton and Ladbroke Parish Councils to discuss their concerns and clarify any misconceptions. Questions and answers sessions were held with local residents to clarify any concerns that they might have before they made their representations.
- 1.11 The Harbury Cement Works Masterplan was considered by the Dasset Area Community Committee on 20 November 2007 and was adopted as SPD on 17 December 2007 by the Executive of the Council.

## Appendix 1 - Schedule of Organizations & Persons Consulted

Bridgman Services Ltd	DSM Demolition Limited	United Co-operatives Ltd
Vinegar Hill Ltd.	Geoffrey Prince Associates Ltd	J Christopher Ashton
Smith Bros & Webb Ltd	Bancroft Cruisers	Stewart Ross Associates
Levvel Ltd	M E Timms	Minitram Systems Ltd
Midlands Architecture and the Designed Environment	Ridgewind Ltd	Sankey Marine
Rembitt Ltd	BT Group Plc	Roba Metals Ltd
Thomas Barlow & Anthony J Archer	Cushman & Wakefield	Compton Scorpion Estate
C.J. & J.D. Cole	Color Estates Ltd	D E Harman
Alcester Estates Ltd.	JS Bloor (Services) Ltd.	RMC Group PLC
The Althorp Estate	David Wilson Homes	G.P. & C.M. Sampson
Brockhall Village Limited	Smiths Gore	Knight Frank
Redrow Homes (Midlands)Ltd	John Baylis	William Davis Ltd
M Paddock	M. Terry	Michael R. Wright
Mr A Crean	Mr Brian Moore	Mr C Hodges
Mr C Swan	Mr G & Ms G Lines & Kitchen	Mr Neil Hobday
Mrs Halina Poloczek	Mrs J.D & Mr T. Clarke	Linfoot Homes
Trustees of the Grammar School of King Edward VI	Peter J. & Jane M. Beeley	R Crompton
Miller Strategic Land	Richard & Mandy Purser	Richard Anthony Moore
Retirement Security Ltd	Howkins and Harrison	Hallam Land Management Limited
George Wimpey South Midlands Ltd	T. Coggins	The Baker Trust c/o Fletcher King

## Appendix 1 - Schedule of Organizations & Persons Consulted

Thomas Whitaker	W J Kliszewicz	Orbit Housing Association
Jephson Housing Association Group	Bromford Housing Group	South Warwickshire Housing Association
Warwickshire Rural Housing Association	Gloucestershire Housing Association	Oxfordshire County Council
Wyre Forest District Council	Cherwell District Council	South Northamptonshire Council
Bromsgrove District Council	Warwickshire County Council (Museum Field Services - Ecology)	Daventry District Council
Warwickshire County Council (Resources - Property )	Wychavon District Council	Cotswold District Council
Warwickshire County Council (Museum Field Services - Archaeology)	Worcester City Council	Malvern Hills District Council
Solihull Metropolitan Borough Council	Warwickshire County Council (Education)	Warwickshire County Council
Redditch Borough Council	Gloucestershire County Council	Northamptonshire County Council
Rugby Borough Council - Planning Policy Team	Worcestershire County Council	West Midlands Regional Assembly
West Oxfordshire District Council	Warwick District Council - Policy & Projects Team	Alcester Group of Liberal Democrat Councillors
Freight Transport Association - Midlands Region	Alcester & District Local History Society	ACRE (Policy)
Barge Association	Rochdale Canal Trust	Action for New Educational Resources for Alcester
Historic Narrow Boat Owners Club	Company of the Proprietors of Stroudwater Navigation	Alcester Opportunities
Studley Liberal Democrat Team	Shakespokes	Laura Mazzoli
Advantage Alcester	Bude Canal Trust	Oversley Green Residents' Association
Centre for International Transport Studies	Alcester Business Network	Stratford Rugby Football Club
6024 Preservation Society Limited	Common Ground	Pathfinder Tours
New Facilities for Alcester High School Technology College	Stratford-upon-Avon Canal Society	Bidford Sports & Community Initiative
Waterways Trust	Stratford-on-Avon & South Warks Liberal Democrats	Rural Housing Trust - HQ

## Appendix 1 - Schedule of Organizations & Persons Consulted

Twentieth Century Society	Sambourne Village Association	Greenpeace
Ramblers Association - Southam Group	Victorian Society	Gypsy Council
Help the Aged	Young Farmers	Warwickshire Geological Conservation Group
Cyclists' Touring Club - HQ	Camping & Caravanning Club	Disability Rights Commission
National Housing Federation	Town & Country Planning Association	Women's National Commission
Inland Waterways Association (HQ)	Ancient Monuments Society	Georgian Group
National House Building Council	Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings	Tidbury Green Residents' Association
Warwickshire Association of Village Halls	Warwickshire Gardens Trust	Ilmington Village Plan Working Group
British Horse Society	Alveston & Tiddington Allotments & Gardens Assoc.	The British Wind Energy Association
Alcester SCAN	Council for Voluntary Service	Shakespeare Line Promotion Group
South Warwickshire Tourism Ltd.	Warwickshire and West Mids Association of Local Councils	Stratford-upon-Avon Town Management Partnership
Greenway Association	Alveston Villagers' Association	Shottery Village Association
Stratford-upon-Avon Society	Warwickshire Wildlife Trust	Stratford-on-Avon Cycling Campaign
Shipston SCAN	Home Builders Federation	Council for British Archaeology (HQ)
Heart of England Tourist Board (HETB)	Local Agenda 21 Forum	Inland Waterways Association
Royal Society for the Protection of Birds (RSPB)	British Trust for Conservation Volunteers (Warks) (BTCV)	Coventry & Warwickshire Friend
CTC (National HQ)	Upper Avon Navigation Trust Ltd	Friends of the Earth - Stratford-upon-Avon
Disability Living Foundation	Stratford SCAN	Stratford District Manufacturers Association
Birmingham Road Action Group	Tiddington Residents Association	Country Land and Business Association (CLBA)
Tredington Society	Rollright Trust	Henley-in-Arden Society

## Appendix 1 - Schedule of Organizations & Persons Consulted

TRANSPORT 2000 (Hereford & Worcester)	Sustrans (Midlands)	Groundwork UK
Warwickshire Rural Hub	YMCA	Countryside Alliance
Garden History Society	Warwickshire Playing Fields Association	Inland Waterways Association - Warks Branch
Earlswood & Forshaw Heath Residents' Association	Henley SC.AN	Age Concern Warwickshire
Heart of England Way Association	Tiddington Road Residents Association	Royal Agricultural Society of England
Rural Forum for Coventry, Solihull & Warwickshire	Joint Committee on Mobility for the Disabled	Long Marston Appraisal Flood Team
Alcester Chamber of Trade and Commerce	South Warwickshire Access Group	Woodland Trust
Lighthorne Society	Wellesbourne Village Society	Aston Cantlow Action Group
Open Spaces Society	Harbury Society	Warwickshire Rural Community Council
Town Design Group	Railway Development Society (North Midlands)	Cotswolds Conservation Board
Theatres Trust	Residents Against Shottery Expansion (RASE)	Stratford Voice
CPRE (South Warwickshire)	Bidford Appraisal Group	Stratford-upon-Avon Rail Transport Group
Shipston-on-Stour Local History Society	Council for British Archaeology (Region)	CPRE Redditch Group
Stratford Rail Transport Group	Bridgetown Residents Association	Winyates Green Residents Association
Bishopton Residents Action Group	Wellesbourne Village Society	Upper Avon Navigation Trust
Race Equality Support Worker	National Playing Fields Association (NPFA)	English Golf Union - Golf Services
Cotswold Line Promotion Group	Lakes Partnership	South Warwickshire PIE - Promoting Inclusion and Enterprise
ILEAP	Welford-on-Avon Local History Society	Railway Development Society - West Midlands
Stratford upon Avon Town Trust	Ramblers' Association - Stratford-on-Avon Group	Rail Freight Group
National Playing Fields Association (NPFA)	Salford Priors Residents' Action Group (SPRAG)	Shakespeare Birthplace Trust

## Appendix 1 - Schedule of Organizations & Persons Consulted

Rowan Organisation	CPRE Warwickshire Branch	Royal National Institute for Deaf People
Royal National Institute for the Blind	Ramblers Association (Warwickshire Area)	West Midlands Planning Aid Service
National Farmers Union	Stour Power	Alcester Civic Society
Business Link	Inland Waterways Amenity Advisory Council	Tanworth-in-Arden Residents Association
Farming and Wildlife Advisory Group (FWAG)	Commission for Rural Communities	Luddington Action Committee
Bidford-on-Avon Residents Group	Bishopton Avenue Residents' Association	Clopton Conservation Committee
James Plaskitt, MP	John Maples MP	Barcheston & Willington Parish Meeting
Preston Bagot Parish Meeting	Arrow Parish Council	Oxhill Parish Council
Farnborough Parish Council	Hampton Lucy Parish Council	Binton Parish Council
Tredington Parish Council	Lighthorne Parish Council	Bishops Itchington Parish Council
Coughton Parish Council	Pillerton Priors Parish Council	Alcester Town Council
Priors Hardwick Parish Meeting	Mappleborough Green Parish Council	Fenny Compton Parish Council
Cherington & Stourton Joint Parish Council	Ladbroke Parish Council	Weston-on-Avon Parish Meeting
Moreton Morrell Parish Council	Sutton-under-Brailes Parish Meeting	Shipston-on-Stour Town Council
Newbold Pacey & Ashorne Parish Council	Clifford Chambers Parish Council	Tanworth-in-Arden Parish Council
Studley Parish Council	Hodnell & Wills Pastures Parish Meeting	Butlers Marston Parish Council
Barton-on-the-Heath Parish Council	Pillerton Hersey Parish Council	Exhall Parish Council
Priors Marston Parish Council	Aston Cantlow Parish Council	Wilmcote Parish Council
Compton Wynyates Parish Meeting	Brailes Parish Council	Temple Grafton Parish Council
Bidford-on-Avon Parish Council	Southam Town Council	Whichford Parish Council

## Appendix 1 - Schedule of Organizations & Persons Consulted

Napton-on-the-Hill Parish Council	Charlecote Parish Meeting	Ufton Parish Council
Tidmington Parish Meeting	Little Wolford Parish Meeting	Snitterfield Parish Council
Wormleighton & Stoneton Parish Meetings	Kinwarton Parish Council	Admington Parish Council
Tysoe Parish Council	Little Compton Parish Council	Luddington Parish Council
Weethley Parish Meeting	Watergall Parish Meeting	Great Wolford Parish Council
Wolverton Parish Council	Dorsington Parish Council	Fulbrook Parish Meeting
Langley Parish Council	Wixford Parish Council	Honington Parish Meeting
Haselor Parish Council	Wellesbourne Parish Council	Great Alne Parish Council
Chapel Ascote Parish Meeting	Morton Bagot, Oldberrow & Spennall Parish Council	Whatcote Parish Meeting
Avon Dassett Parish Council	Alderminster Parish Council	Chesterton & Kingston Parish Meeting
Bearley Parish Council	Kineton Parish Council	Gaydon Parish Council
Salford Priors Parish Council	Combrook Parish Council	Long Marston Parish Council (Marston Sicca)
Long Compton Parish Council	Preston-on-Stour Parish Council	Warmington Parish Council
Harbury Parish Council	Ullenhall Parish Council	Loxley Parish Council
Beaudesert & Henley-in-Arden Joint Parish Council	Idlicote Parish Meeting	Billesley Parish Meeting
Chadshunt Parish Meeting	Quinton Parish Council	Atherstone-on-Stour Parish Meeting
Ettington Parish Council	Compton Verney Parish Meeting	Whitchurch Parish Meeting
Burmington Parish Meeting	Claverdon Parish Council	Burton Dassett Parish Council
Old Stratford & Drayton Parish Council	Lighthorne Heath Parish Council	Halford Parish Council
Stretton-on-Fosse Parish Council	Ilmington Parish Council	Ratley & Upton Parish Council

## Appendix 1 - Schedule of Organizations & Persons Consulted

Long Itchington Parish Council	Stratford-upon-Avon Town Council	Upper & Lower Shuckburgh Parish Meeting
Radway Parish Council	Sambourne Parish Council	Wootton Wawen Parish Council
Shotteswell Parish Council	Welford-on-Avon Parish Council	Stockton Parish Council
Chastleton Parish Council	Mickleton Parish Council	Byfield Parish Council
Bickmarsh Parish Meeting	Charwelton Parish Council	Ebrington Parish Council
Boddington Parish Council	Hockley Heath Parish Council	Batsford Parish Council
Blockley Parish Council	Moreton in Marsh Town Council	Cornwell Parish Meeting
Inkberrow Parish Council	Hellidon Parish Council	Evenlode Parish Council
Pebworth Parish Council	Harvington Parish Council	North and Middle Littleton Parish Council
Abbots Morton Parish Council	Church Lench Parish Council	Beoley Parish Council
Wythall Parish Council	Todenham Parish Council	Cleeve Prior Parish Council
Salford Parish Council	Catesby Parish Council	Staverton Parish Council
Rollright Parish Council	South Warwickshire Primary Care Trust	npower
Central Networks	National Grid	Warwickshire Fire & Rescue Service
Commission for Architecture and the Built Environment National Trust	East Midlands Regional Assembly English Heritage (West Midlands Region)	South Warwickshire General Hospitals NHS Trust WMPTA (Centro)
Network Rail	Severn Trent Water - Network Development	Tourism West Midlands
Health & Safety Executive	Rural Housing Enabler for Warwickshire	British Waterways (West Midlands)
Warwickshire Police	Trinity Court Surgery	Bidford-on-Avon Health Centre
Environment Agency - Thames Region, West Area	Forestry Commission	Thames Water

## Appendix 1 - Schedule of Organizations & Persons Consulted

Housing Corporation (West Midlands)	Natural England	British Waterways South East
Environment Agency	Midlands Architecture and the Designed Environment (MADE)	Museums, Libraries and Archives West Midlands
Warwickshire Police	Sport England West Midlands	South East Regional Assembly
Defence Estates	Network Rail Infrastructure Ltd	South West Regional Assembly
Warwickshire Police	Warwickshire Police	Severn Trent Water Ltd - StampS Team
Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM)	Advantage West Midlands	Arts Council West Midlands
Coventry and Warwickshire Learning and Skills Council	Highways Agency	Culture West Midlands
Defence Estates		
Councillor G. Roache	Councillor A. Patrick	Councillor A.J. Akeister
Councillor A.J. Cronin	Councillor A.R. Dixon	Councillor Brian W Slaughter
Councillor C H Bates	Councillor C R Williams	Councillor C. Thomas
Councillor C.J. Saint	Councillor Daren Pemberton	Councillor David J Close
Councillor F.P. Barnes	Councillor H.D. Wright	Councillor I. Seccombe
Councillor J E M Fradgley	Councillor J H Harrison	Councillor J R Appleton
Councillor J.D. Short	Councillor K.A. James	Councillor Keith Lloyd
Councillor L T Marshall	Councillor L.A. Topham	Councillor L.C. Bowring
Councillor Leslie R Hewer	Councillor Louise E Giblin	Councillor Lynda M Organ
Councillor M A Flower	Councillor M L Perry	Councillor M.C. Brain
Councillor Maureen L Beckett	Councillor Nigel I Rock	Councillor P A Beaman
Councillor P S Seccombe	Councillor P.A. Price	Councillor P.G.W. Moorse

## Appendix 1 - Schedule of Organizations & Persons Consulted

Councillor R. Hobbs	Councillor R. Stevens	Councillor R. Wright
Councillor R.D. White	Councillor S Gray	Councillor S Thirlwell
Councillor S.A. Juned	Councillor S.D. Beese	Councillor S.H. Jackson
Councillor Sir William Lawrence Bt	Councillor Sue Main	Councillor Sue Wixey
Councillor Susan Adams	Councillor T W J Russel	Councillor Vince Seaman
Councillor Jill Dill-Russell	Councillor David Booth	Councillor George Atkinson
Councillor Helen McCarthy	Councillor Nina Knapman	Councillor Richard Hyde
ACL Consultants	Adcock Associates Design Practice	Acanthus Clews Architects
Alcester Estates Ltd.	Allied Management Services Ltd.	Allison Millward Associates
Althorp Estate	Amec Design & Management	Architects Workshop
Architectural Drawing Services	Architecture & Planning Group	Arlington Planning Services
Arlington Securities plc	Arrow Properties	Arup Economic Consultants
Ashton Planning	Associated Construction Consultants	B.D.S. Marketing
Bainbridge & Co	Baker Associates	Baker Goodchild Architects
C. Baldwin	Barton Fellows Ltd.	Barton Willmore Planning Partnership - Cambridge
Barton Willmore Planning Partnership - HQ	Basil Merrick	Brian R. Bassett Ltd.
Batterton Tyack Architects	BDP Planning	James C. Beaumont
Beckett Associates	Bell Cornwell Partnership	Rachel Berger
Berry & Young	Berry Morris	Ernest Berry
Bigwood Ltd.	Bigwood Ltd.	Bigwood Ltd.
Robert L. Blackburn	BM3 Architecture Ltd	Boreham Construction Engineers

## **Appendix 2 – Schedule of Agents Consulted**

Bournville Architects	Boyer Planning	John Bradley Associates
Brian Barber Associates	Brock Planning Consultancy	Peter Bromwich & Co.
Brown Matthews	Brunton Design Associates	Building Design Services
R. Burman	Burton Emery Partnership	Patrick J. Burton
Business Environments Planning	E.R. Byron Associates	Calarel Design Partnership
Carter Jonas	Robert Cartwright & Co.	Cartwright Marston Estate Agents

## Appendix 2 – Schedule of Agents Consulted

Cater & Day	Lyndon F. Cave	J.M. Chambers
Chancellors, Chartered Town Planning Consultants	W.M. Chapman	Nicholas Haycock & Co
Chartered Town Planning Consultancy	John Chivers & Sons	Richard Chivers
Clark Solicitors	Peter Clarke & Co.	Client Construction Co.
J John Clink & Associate	Clive Brook Associates	Cluttons
K. Coffey	Cofton Land & Property	Colin Buchanan & Partners
Collin Jones Partnership	Compton Estates Management Services	T.S.E. Cooper
Alexander Corfield	Cork Toft Partnership Ltd	Corstorphine & Wright
Countrywide Property Management	Courtyard Designs	The Roger Coy Partnership
Peter Creswell & Associates	Cross & Harris	Rodney Crossley
A. Crowson	Cullen, Carter & Hill	Cumming Architects
J.C. Cunnane Associates	D & T Holt	D N Cull
David L. Waller Chartered Surveyors	David Lock Associates Ltd.	R.A. Davis
Day Design Group, Laurie	Debenham, Tewson & Chesshire Ltd. - Birmingham	Debois Landscape Survey Group
Denham Design Partnership	Denton Wilde Sapte	Derek Latham and Associates
Derek Lovejoy Partnership	Design & Materials Ltd.	Development Planning & Design Services Ltd
Development Planning Partnership	Dilworth Design	Dixon, Dobson & Carver
Donald W. Insall & Associates (Chester)	Donald W. Insall & Associates (London)	Dreweatt Neate
Drivers Jonas	Drivers Jonas	DTZ Pieda Consulting
R.A. Dunn	R.J. Durrell	ERB Associates

## Appendix 2 – Schedule of Agents Consulted

John Earle & Son	Eastbrook Associates (Architects) Ltd.	Ecotec Research & Consulting Ltd.
Edmund Kirby	G.H.W. Ensor	Entec UK Ltd.
Entec UK Ltd.	Evershed Wells & Hind	Fordham Research Ltd.
FPD Savills	FPD Savills	Frank Price
Frederick J. Young	Freeth Cartwright Hunt Dickins	R.W. Fryer
Fuller Peiser & Co.	G Jones Associates	G K Y Design, GKY
G V A Grimley	G V A Grimley - Planning (Birmingham)	G.P. Grima
G.R. Milton	GB Partnership	Roy Geden
Geoffrey Wheeler and Associates	Godfrey-Payton	Gough Planning Services
Gould Singleton Partnership	Gouldens Solicitors	Graham Pearce & Company
Granger & Jones	Andrew Grant & Co.	Peter Green Associates
Halcrow Fox & Associates	Grodon Hall	Halliwell Landau
Hamptons	Hamptons	Hancocks Solicitors
Harding Design	Anthony J. Harman	Harris Cooper & Co.
Margaret Harris	E.W Harvey	Hawkes, Edwards & Cave
Haxworth Architects	Hayball Associates	Healey & Baker
Heath Avery Partnership	Henman Ballard	Simon Herrick
Highpoint Rendel	Barton Willmore Planning Partnership-Eastern	Hitchman Stone Partnership
Christopher Hobson	Holden & Leonard	Steven Holloway
Holmes Bury Savage Hayward Partnership	J.D. Holmes	R. Holtom

## Appendix 2 – Schedule of Agents Consulted

John B. Homer & Co.	Professor Alan Hooper	Horner Allen Partnership
Hossack Broome	Howard & Seddon Partnership	Howkins & Harrison
Howkins & Harrison	Humberts - Tetbury	Hunt & Wood Partnership
Innes England	Intercull Designs	Jackson-Stops & Staff
Donald James & Partners	Jesson Sewell & Swadkins	Jigs Chana
John Falconer Associates	John P. Morris	John Phillips Planning Consultants
John Jones	Judith A. Thompson	Brian L. King
Knight Frank - Hereford	Knight Frank - London	Knight Frank
R.C. Lamb	Lancelot Dyson Associates	Land Design Associates
Land Use Consultants	Landmark Information Group	Lanesfield Technical Design
Lapworth Partnership Chartered Architects	Lee & Ross Architects	Lee Evans Abbott de Moubray
T.E. Leivers	G.T.D. Lewis	Llewelyn-Davies Planning
Lloyds TSB - Property Management West	Locke & England - Leamington	Locke & England
Lodders Solicitors	E.S. Lodge Associates	Loveitts
Loveitts - Leamington Spa	Lumar Developments Ltd.	Robert Lunn & Lowth
M. Cox	MAC Design Services	Magdalen College - Surveyor
Malcolm Scott Consultants Ltd.	Manning Design Group	Brian G. Manning
Margetts	Marson Architects	Marson Rathbone Taylor
E.H. Marston & Co.	Martin Elliot Partnership	Martin Sedgewick
Martin Shearon	Martineau Johnson	Martyn Bramich Associates

## Appendix 2 – Schedule of Agents Consulted

RPS Planning, Transport & Environment Ltd.	RPS Planning, Transport & Environment Ltd.	R. Mason
Matthews and Goodman	McCoy Associates	Michael E. Megeary
Rodney Melville & Partners	Richard Merrett	Michael Partridge Partnership
Montagu Evans	H. Moore	MVM Planning Ltd
Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners - London	Needham & James	Needham & James
F.C.Newman & Co.	R.A. Newton	Noralle Building Design Services
Oldfield King Planning	Oldfield King Planning	O'Neill & Bracewell Partnership
Ove Arup Partnership	Oxfordshire Building Surveying & Design Ltd.	P. Stanton, Esq
P.D.B. Construction Services, PDB	Geoffrey Parker Bourne	I. Parsonage
John Pass Associates	Peacock & Smith	Peter Draper Associates
Peter Seccombe & Sarah Douglas	Phillips Planning Services Ltd	Mrs. M.G. Phillips
A. Pickford	Pinsent Curtis	Planaconstruct Ltd.
Planning & General Services Consultancy	Planning Design Research Associates	Provincial Property Developments Ltd.
R & B M Gale	R. John Craddock Associates	Ragley Estate
Ralphs & Janes	Ramsdens	Rapleys
M.A. Ravenhill	Michael Reardon & Associates	Redgrave Design Group
Reg Ellis	Richard Crook	Hugh Richards
Ridgehaven Project Development	M.A. Riley	RMJM Planning Ltd.
Robert Franklin Architects	Robert Stephenson Associates	Robert Turley Associates - Bristol
Robert Turley Associates - Birmingham	Robert Turley Associates - Winchester	Roberts & Lloyd

## Appendix 2 – Schedule of Agents Consulted

David H. Robotham Ltd.	Roger Evans Associates	Roger P. Dudley & Associates
Roger Stretton Architects	Roger Tym & Partners	G. Rogers & Co.
RPS Group plc	RPS Group plc	RPS Group plc
P.J. Rushton	Russell Little & Platt	Joe Samworth & Associates
E.N. Sandiford, Chartered Surveyor	P.N. Seabourne	Sheldon Bosley - Stratford-upon-Avon
Sheldon Bosley & Partners	Shipway, Doble & Earle - Redditch	Shoosmiths Banbury
D.H. Skeats, Designer	Skillington Payne	Smith Stuart Reynolds
Alan Smith	Elrick Smith	Raymond Smith
Robert F. Smith	A. Sowton	John Spall Design Associates
Spencers	Stanley Partnership	Stansgate Planning Consultants
Steer Davies Gleave	Graham Steventon, Chartered Architect	Stonehouse Chartered Surveyors
Stoneleigh Planning Partnership	Peter Storrie & Associates	Strutt & Parker
Sutch & Thos. Hemming & Son	Sutton & Wilkinson	T.J. McHugh
M.J. Taylor	P. Thimbleby	Thornton Hartnell Chartered Architects
Three Counties Insurance Brokers	Malcolm Timms	Titmuss Sainer and Webb
Tom Cole	Town & Country Properties	Trevor Bury
J. Tulip	Tweedale Planning & Design Group	Tyler-Parkes Partnership
Paul Upfield	L.M. Uzzells, Designs	Vincent & Gorbing Planning Associates
Wallis Design Associates	Cliff Walsingham & Co.	Warwick Estates
Weatherall, Green & Smith	Weatherall, Green & Smith	W.J.L. Weaver

## Appendix 2 – Schedule of Agents Consulted

White Young Green Planning	Andrew White	P. & E. Whitticase
P. Wilkes	C. Milton Wilkinson	Peter E. Williams, Building & Design Consultant
Framptons	Wood, Kendrick & Williams	Wootton Jeffreys Consultants Ltd - Epsom
Wright Hassall & Co.	WS Atkins Rail	WS Atkins Transportation Engineering
WTS Ltd	Adams Holmes Associates	The Residents of Friday Furlong
Paul Dickinson Associates	P.T. Pratt	David Storer & Partners
Andrew Nailor	Lawrence Jurman	Bidford on Avon Residents Group (BARG)
Vicki Gittus	Shoosmiths Solicitors	Howkins and Harrison
Timothy Lea & Griffiths	Charles Russell Solicitors	Gordon Herringshaw & Associates
James Barr	Longview Consultancy	S W Hinton BSc MRICS
J Christopher Ashton	Tony Thorpe Associates	William McFarland
Fisher German Chartered Surveyors	A E Cox FRICS Chartered Surveyors	CT Planning
Jones Lang Lasalle	King Sturge	Brooke Smith Associates
Tetlow King Planning	Pegasus Planning Group	Holmes Antill
Bigwood Ltd.	Wood Frampton	Framptons
Tim North Associates	RPS Planning, Transport & Environment Ltd.	ATIS Real Weatheralls
Tetlow King Planning	Simon Taylor, Chartered Town Planner	Stansgate Planning Consultants
Hunter Page Planning	Stewart Vick Associates	Kember Loudon Williams
Paul Kentish & Co	Banner Homes	Interact Associates
RPS Group plc	Terence O'Rourke	GVA Grimley

## Appendix 2 – Schedule of Agents Consulted

Michael Jones	DTZ Piedad Consulting	Jones Lang Lasalle
Star Planning & Development	Atisreal	Planning Potential
Pegasus Planning Group (East Midlands)	DPDS Consulting Group	Roger Tym & Partners
Stewart Ross Associates	Tetlow King Planning	Malcolm Judd & Partners
Jones Lang LaSalle	Mono Consulting Ltd	Peter Short R.I.B.A., Chartered Architect
Set Design	Nicholas de Jong Associates	Barton Willmore Partnership
Sanderson Weatherall	Nabarro Nathanson	CB Richard Ellis
Matthews and Goodman	Planning Potential	Hulme Upright Manning
Armstrong Burton Planning	Hives Planning	GL Hearn
White Young Green Planning		

**Masterplan for Harbury Cement Works – Draft Supplementary Planning Document  
Schedule of representations received and the Council’s response**

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council’s Proposed Response
1	Councillor Andrew Patrick	<p>Congratulates the District Council for the preparation of the Masterplan.</p> <p>Concerns expressed are: Vision Statement can better hang together grammatically by the following suggestion:</p> <p>To deliver a high quality development that: Is sustainable ... Is well integrated ... Meets ... Protects and enhances ...</p> <p>The Masterplan should ensure that whenever a hotel is mentioned reference to Section 22 is made. Same should apply to Fig 53.</p> <p>Repetition noted in Sections 30 and 31.</p> <p>Reference to number of storeys in Page 44 should be considered because that could create overdevelopment.</p> <p>Masterplan can also consider the wider area to embrace the Ufton Nature Reserve and the proposed Ufton – Harbury cycleway.</p>	<p>Comments are of minor editorial nature that will enhance the quality of the Masterplan without undermining its substance and is acceptable.</p> <p>Minor omission which is acceptable.</p> <p>Minor editorial change which is acceptable.</p> <p>It is reasonable to accept that defining the number of storeys for potential lodges without consideration of the scale and bulk of a proposal could be presumptuous. It is however important that a form of wording is introduced to ensure that any proposal will not have detrimental impact on the character of the area.</p> <p>The Masterplan has a defined boundary specified in the Local Plan as Inset Map 5.5. Going beyond that boundary to include areas such as the Ufton Nature Reserve could create a number of difficulties such as conformity of the Masterplan with the provisions of the Local Plan if an objection were to be raised, matters</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
			<p>relating to timing and funding etc. There are other issues such as land and ownership matters that may need to be resolved and what can and cannot be done. These are matters that cannot be allowed to delay the Masterplan process, in particular, when it is acknowledged that the Masterplan has a defined area established in the Local Plan and the timing for its preparation has already been approved by the Council in its Local Development Scheme.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modification</b></p> <p><b>Vision Statement be modified as follows:</b>  <b>To deliver a high quality development that:</b>  <b>is sustainable ...</b>  <b>is well integrated ...</b>  <b>meets ...</b>  <b>protects and enhances ...</b></p> <p><b>Section 30 should be deleted and consequential changes made to subsequent numbering.</b></p> <p><b>Third sentence of para. 31.6 should be deleted and replaced with the following: 'The form, mass, height and scale of any potential lodges should be in-keeping with the character of the area, taking into account the varying topography of the site. Consequential changes should be made to explanatory text to Figures 70 and 71.</b></p> <p><b>Reference should be made to Section 22 in Fig.53.</b></p>
2	Advantage West Midlands (AWM)	Although Stratford-on-Avon District lies outside the Regeneration Zones and the High Technology Corridors which represent the core spatial elements of the West Midlands Economic Strategy (WMES), the delivery of	

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>the development proposals in the Masterplan can make a useful contribution to the broad objectives of the WMES. In particular, the Masterplan provides for enhanced informal recreation and leisure opportunities which would complement South Warwickshire's tourism appeal. Also bringing forward a previously developed site for employment purposes should ensure appropriate employment opportunities for local people.</p> <p>There might be a case to look at the proposed rail infrastructure in the context of the rail line gauge enhancement project between Southampton and Nuneaton which is currently identified in the Freight Route Utilisation Strategy. However, the proposed railhead's size, the scale of the development and its location in an area where the existing road infrastructure is relatively poor may present difficulties when the feasibility of successful delivery of the proposal is considered.</p>	<p>The potential contribution that the development proposals in the Masterplan could make to the WMES has been acknowledged by AWM. The relatively small size of the site (about 10 ha) compared to 60 ha needed for a strategic interchange was fully debated at the Local Plan Public Inquiry. The suitability of the site for a specialist interchange use was accepted to be the most appropriate and deliverable option for this particular site. In this regard, the reinstatement of the rail link to serve employment use of the site should continue to be an essential pre-requisite to employment development of the site which is over and above what is designed to meet an identified local need.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
3	The Theatres Trust	No comment to make.	No response.
4	Sport England	Use of the site for recreational purposes should take into account the landscape quality of the area.	The need to protect the landscape quality of the site is comprehensively covered in the Masterplan. Indeed, a whole section has been devoted to deal with this topic with a strategy for protection and enhancement (see Section 13 of the Masterplan).

<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>	<b>District Council's Proposed Response</b>
		<p>There should be a robust Management Plan to protect biodiversity of the site.</p> <p>Uses other than fishing such as canoeing should be considered. Parts of the water could be used for model boats. Other uses such as family cycling horse riding etc can be promoted.</p> <p>Any new housing and employment provision should make a contribution towards new or existing sports facilities via Section 106 Agreements.</p>	<p>The Masterplan requires a Management Plan to be submitted as part of any proposal that comes forward for development. Section 32 of the Masterplan deals with this matter in detail.</p> <p>The Masterplan promotes uses other than fishing on the site. In fact the site already has planning permission for water sport activities, including canoeing, jet and water skiing.</p> <p>Decisions about the appropriateness and coverage of Section 106 Agreements will be resolved during the planning application stage of the process. In assessing this, the Council will be concerned to ensure that the requirements of Circular 05/2005 are adhered to.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.</p>
5	The Garden History Society	No comment.	No response.
6	South West Regional Assembly	Will respond if considered appropriate.	No response.
7	Warwickshire County Council (WCC) – Environment and Economy Department	<p>Generally satisfied with the content of the Masterplan in respect of highways and transportation matter. Specific detailed comments are.</p> <p>Para 27.3.1 – add 'and other alternative traffic routes in the vicinity' to bullet point 3. It should be made clear that unbound surfacing described in para. 27.4.2 Would not be suitable for adoption.</p> <p>Are Fig 59 and the final sentence of para. 27.3.4 necessary if the outcome of the Transport Assessment will determine</p>	<p>The suggested addition to para. 27.3.1 and clarification of para. 27.4.2 is reasonable and acceptable.</p> <p>Clarification has been sought about comments relating to Fig59. WCC is happy for Fig 59 to be retained but related to the connectivity section. It needs to be</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>appropriate mitigation measures.</p> <p>The provision of a railhead to serve future employment development is a pre-requisite that is fully supported by the County.</p> <p>Masterplan appears to be in full accordance with the Development Plan and RSS and has the County Council's full support.</p>	<p>emphasised that these are strategic highway connections between various uses on the site. Also to be emphasised is that the unbound surfacing for secondary routes will not be suitable for adoption.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modifications</b></p> <p><b>Add 'and other alternative traffic routes in the vicinity' to bullet point 3 of para 27.3.1.</b></p> <p><b>Para 27.4.2 should emphasise that the surfacing of the proposed secondary routes will not be suitable for adoption because they are not designed to adoptable standards.</b></p> <p><b>Figure 59 should relate to section 27.2. Consequently, the last sentence of para 27.3.4 be deleted to be included as a new sentence under Section 27.2. The wording of the new sentence should be 'Fig 59 is a Map showing the strategic highway connections between various uses on the site.'</b></p>
8	Jenny Patrick	<p>Section 22 should be referred to whenever a hotel is mentioned.</p> <p>Figs 57 and 58 only differ by the proposed hotel.</p> <p>M4 should be M40.</p> <p>Fig 59 shows extra set of lodges.</p> <p>A second access point on Fig 60 might not be suitable for major traffic movement and could</p>	<p>Reference to Section 22 where ever a hotel is mentioned has already been noted.</p> <p>Figs 57 and 58 are two different figures for two different purposes and should be retained as such.</p> <p>Reference to M4 is an editorial error that will be corrected.</p> <p>The set of lodges to the east of B4451 in Fig. 59 should be deleted to be consistent with the intentions of the Masterplan.</p> <p>A Transport Assessment is required to be carried out as part of any relevant proposal to development the site.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		lead to an increase in volume of traffic in residential areas.	<p>The methodology and the outcome of this assessment will need to be agreed by the Highways Agency and the County Council. It is unlikely that the District Council will accept a TA which is disputed by the County and the Highways Agency. It is therefore reasonable to suggest that the outcome of this exercise should determine any further main access points to serve the site. Figure 60 should be amended to reflect this by deleting the red arrow to the east of the diagram.</p> <p><b>Proposed modifications</b></p> <p><b>Reference to M4 should be M40</b></p> <p><b>Delete set of lodges to the East of B4451 on Fig 59.</b></p> <p><b>Fig 60 should be modified by deleting access point east to the railway line.</b></p>
9	Richard Bennett	<p>Masterplan seems to be well considered in almost all respects and should be commended. However, the second access point unto Ladbroke Road is objected to for a number of reasons including – contrary to the remainder of Masterplan, result in loss of existing recreational assets, affected lanes unsuitable for commercial vehicles.</p> <p>Would like his name to be removed from the list of Stakeholders because he represented Ladbroke Parish Council which is already mentioned in the list.</p>	<p>Matter dealt with above. Access point is recommended to be deleted.</p> <p>Request to delete name from the list of stakeholders is acceptable.</p> <p><b>Proposed modification</b></p> <p><b>Remove Richard Bennett from the list of Stakeholders.</b></p>
10	Dr Jon Radley – Keeper of Geology, Warwickshire	It welcomes detailed consideration given to statutory and non-statutory geological sites/conservation schemes.	

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
	Museum	<p>Acknowledgements section should acknowledge Warwickshire Geological Conservation Group.</p> <p>Might be helpful to provide some captions to some of the photos.</p> <p>It needs to be stated that Warwickshire Museum has significant holdings of geological specimens from the Harbury quarries.</p> <p>Page 22 – recent site visit indicates that the mound has considerable public educational potential as a geological resource, to be managed with full consideration to ecological interest.</p> <p>Section 17.1 – should reflect the potential geological resource of the spoil tip for public use.</p> <p>List on Appendix 2 should include Jon Radley - Warwickshire Museum's Geologist and Ian Fenwick – Warwickshire Geological Conservation Group's RIGS Officer.</p>	<p>The contribution of Warwickshire Conservation Group and the Warwickshire Museum's Geologist to the Masterplan has been significant and invaluable. It is an oversight that their contribution was not acknowledged. The Masterplan should be modified to reflect that.</p> <p>The user-friendliness and understanding of the Masterplan will be improved by annotating diagrams and photos</p> <p>The potential of the mound as a geological resource is unquestionable. A number of significant finds were made during the Council's field visit with the Warwickshire Museum's Ecologist. The finds are added to the collection that the Museum hold about the site. The educational implications of the mound as a geological resource need to be emphasised.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modification</b></p> <p><b>The Acknowledgement section and Appendix 2 should include: Warwickshire Geological Conservation Group; Warwickshire Museum's Geologist; and Jon Radley and Ian Fenwick respectively.</b></p> <p><b>Annotate diagrams and photos where possible.</b></p> <p><b>The following sentence should be added to Page 22 (Area L – Mound) 'The mound has considerable public educational potential as a geological resource. This needs to be managed with full consideration to ecological interest'.</b></p> <p><b>Section 17.1 should be modified to reflect the</b></p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
			<b>geological potential of the spoil tip by adding the following sentence 'Any redevelopment of the site should be sympathetic to the Blue Lias exposures with full consideration given to ecological interest.'</b>
11	Ian Fenwick (RIGS Officer) – Warwickshire Geological Conservation Group	<p>Encouraged by the strong statements in the Masterplan in support conservation and enhancement of the geological assets of the site, notably the SSSI. Legibility of Maps should be improved.</p> <p>Para 17.4 – add sediments after soft glacial.            Para 15.1 Area 9 (Quarry Faces) – more emphasis should be given to the need to control tree growth in the SSSI areas as colonisation by woody plants has severely impeded access. Para 13.6 (Area L and 27.6.4 – a footpath should be located so as to serve the SSSI section on the southern margin of the eastern site.</p>	<p>Suggested amendments to para 17.4, and para 15.1 Area 9 are minor and reasonable and would not undermine the substance of the paragraphs.</p> <p>The need to make both the geological and ecological assets of the site accessible to local people and for education use has been recognised and emphasised as one of the main proposals of the Masterplan. The nature and form of access should be determined at the design stage of the development process. The Connectivity Maps will be amended to indicate the principle of having access to the SSSIs.</p> <p><b>Proposed modifications</b>  <b>The word 'sediments' should be inserted after soft glacial in para. 17.4.</b></p> <p><b>Add the following sentence to Para 15.1 Area 9 (quarry faces): 'It is important to control tree growth in the SSSI areas as colonisation by woody plants has severely impeded access.'</b></p> <p><b>Amend Connectivity Diagrams to indicate access to the SSSIs on the site.</b></p>
12	Butterfly	Impressed about the level of consideration	

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
	Conservation (Jane Ellis)	<p>given to the environmental sensitivity of the site. Supports the production of wildlife management plan suggested in the Masterplan.</p> <p>Section 11 gives a good and accurate explanation of the ecological value of the site. In addition, it should recognise that Small Blue, Dingy Skipper and Grizzled Skipper are all now UK Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Species. (para. 11.4). Also Chalk Carpet (para. 11.5) is a UK BAP species.</p> <p>Para. 12.1 emphasise that 'in exceptional circumstances where the footprint of development affects the most valuable invertebrate habitats on the site the recreation of the habitat should be undertaken and have established prior to development.</p> <p>Supports the idea of higher level entry in Section 32 of the Masterplan.</p> <p>It should be recognised that any road or rail development could potentially provide wildlife linking corridors.</p>	<p>The need to recognise UK BAP species present on the site is acceptable and the Masterplan should be amended to reflect that.</p> <p>The Council will seek to ensure that important habitats on the site are not detrimentally affected by proposed development in the first place. However, it accepts that the potential for this to happen is real and the need to ensure that any habitats affected are adequately protected is critical. A key means to ensuring that this is done effectively is to make sure that new habitats are created and established before the development takes place. Bullet point 5 of Section 12 will be modified to reflect this practical objective.</p> <p>The importance of roads in connecting various uses on the site and the site with its surroundings has already been emphasised. Its importance as potential wildlife corridors will also need to be noted.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modifications</b></p> <p><b>The Masterplan should recognise recently designated UK BAPS species.</b></p> <p><b>Bullet point 5 of para. 12.1 be modified to emphasise that new habitats will be recreated and</b></p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
			<p><b>established before development takes place.</b></p> <p><b>The Masterplan should emphasise the importance of proposed roads and rail line as potential wildlife corridors.</b></p>
13	Southam Town Council	<p>Masterplan is not specifically focussed on Southam to make informed comments.</p> <p>Why should the Masterplan be prepared with public funds rather than by the developer.</p>	<p>The Local Plan clearly specifies that the preparation of the Masterplan should be led by the District Council. The landowner is a key stakeholder who made a significant contribution to the preparation of the Masterplan. The complexity of the issues involved and the variety of interests meant that it was appropriate for the District Council to lead it. More importantly, all the neighbouring parishes wanted the District Council to lead it.</p>
14	J. L. Hancock	<p>Would like to commend SDC for such a detailed Masterplan. Care should be taken to ensure that the fishing lodges with planning approval should not turn out to be dwellings with bedrooms and gardens.</p> <p>Did the Inspector make sure that Network Rail is on board before recommending the reinstatement of the railway line? If not how could the scheme go ahead.</p> <p>Support the idea of more public access to the site, in particular for educational use.</p> <p>Disturbance on the site due to development can compromise biodiversity of the site.</p>	<p>The Council will ensure that the development of the approved fishing lodges is in accordance with the approved plans that were the subject of the planning application. The Council will be prepared to take enforcement action against development that is not in accordance with approved plans.</p> <p>The Local Plan Inspector was right to set out the conditions under which significant employment development of the site could be allowed. This includes the reinstatement of the railway line. The onus is on the developers of the site to demonstrate that these can be met. The Masterplan clearly sets out what will be required when a planning application is submitted to ensure that the railhead is delivered.</p> <p>The Masterplan includes of a number of proposals to ensure that the ecological quality of the site is not affected by any development. The Council believes that the measures proposed in the Masterplan are sufficiently robust to ensure that the ecological value of</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Part of the site is designated as an SSSI. There could be a case for more such designations.</p> <p>No major housing development as stated in the Masterplan should be allowed except that which is designed to meet Bishops Itchington's local need.</p> <p>Against any major alterations to the quarries but very much approve controlled public access for educational and recreational purposes.</p>	<p>the site is not undermined by any development on the site.</p> <p>All the relevant organisations and interests responsible for geological matters such as Natural England and the Warwickshire Geological Conservation Group have been fully involved with the preparation of the Masterplan. If there were to be any suggestion for designations to be made, that proposal will be considered by the Council. It needs to be stressed that it is not the role of the District Council to designate SSSIs.</p> <p>The Masterplan is clear to emphasise that any residential development of the site should be designed specifically to meet the housing needs of Bishops Itchington. Support of local residents to meet their housing need on the Harbury Estate will be a significant factor to be taken into account by the District Council if a housing scheme was to come forward for determination.</p> <p>Access to the site for educational and recreational use has already been acknowledged.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.</p>
15	Harbury Parish Council	<p>Broadly welcomes the Masterplan as an appropriate framework for future development of the site.</p> <p>Agree that residential and general development must be rigorously needs-tested before planning approval is granted.</p> <p>Any rail use should have a viable business case.</p>	<p>The Parish Council broadly welcomes the provisions of the Masterplan but also wish to see that its requirements are met through subsequent stages of the process.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Agree that any development that substantially increase traffic in the area would be undesirable and would want the effects on local roads to be closely monitored.</p> <p>There is an opportunity to link the Ufton Nature Reserve with the Harbury Estate as part of any development.</p> <p>Section 27.6 should be strengthened to include a bridleway and the possibility of linking local footpaths especially to Ufton Nature Reserve.</p> <p>There should be a clear statement to say that presently plans and diagrams are indicative.</p> <p>Fig 59 should not be taken as approval for lodges on the eastern side of the road.</p>	<p>The matter about linking the Masterplan to the Ufton Nature Reserve has already been addressed. The Masterplan has a defined area established in the Local Plan. The case for the recreational use of the Ufton Nature Reserve and its linkage to the Harbury Estate is a separate exercise which the Council may wish to consider.</p> <p>It has been suggested that footpaths SM84 and SM197 be upgraded to bridleway standards. Most of the footpaths fall outside the defined boundary of the Masterplan. However, the County Council's Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan seek improvements to the existing path network both within new development sites and in their surrounding areas. Decisions about the appropriateness and coverage of Section 106 Agreements will be resolved during the planning application stage of the process. In assessing this, the Council will be concerned to ensure that the requirements of Circular 05/2005 are adhered to.</p> <p>It is acceptable for reason of clarity to emphasise that diagrams and plans used in the Masterplan are indicative at this stage. Accurate alignments will be determined at the detailed planning application stage.</p> <p>The lodges on the east of the B4451 road will be deleted to be consistent with the intentions of the Masterplan.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
			<p><b>Proposed Modification</b></p> <p><b>The Masterplan should include a caveat to emphasise that some plans and diagrams are indicative at this stage.</b></p> <p><b>Set of lodges to the East of B4451 on Fig 59 should be deleted.</b></p>
16	Development and Enabling Officer – on behalf of the District Council's Housing Service	<p>The fact that housing development on the site should be designed to meet local need in accordance with Policy COM.1 needs to be emphasised.</p> <p>The fact that the site is in an unsustainable location needs to be clarified.</p> <p>SPD for Meeting Housing Needs is relevant and should be referred to</p> <p>The Masterplan should be explicit about the need to design houses to reflect the potential for working from home.</p>	<p>The importance of Policy COM.1 in determining local housing and employment needs is adequately covered and appropriately emphasised in the Masterplan. Similarly the locational constraints of the site in the context of sustainability and strategic policy are also adequately covered. There is therefore no need for further emphasis to be given to that (see paras. 9.5, 19.2, 20.1.1 and Section 24).</p> <p>Because of the complex nature of the issues surrounding the redevelopment of the site, a range of Local Plan policies and other Council strategies and SPDs would be applicable to the consideration of any proposal for the development on the site. It could be misleading to attempt to list all of them or single out only one of them in the Masterplan. Doing so could give an impression that such a list is exhaustive or one SPD is more important than the other. Para. 9.10 already stresses that there are a range of local plan policies that are likely to be applicable to the consideration of any proposal to develop the site. It is reasonable to add 'and other Council adopted strategies and SPDs to overcome the concern expressed in this regard. The last sentence of para. 20.1 can also be amended to include specific reference to 'Meeting Housing Needs' SPD without overly emphasising its importance as against all other SPDs.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Section 7 'opportunities' should include the scope for the site to meet identified local housing need.</p> <p>The site is a large site but the proportion that can be developed is restricted and the Masterplan should emphasise that.</p> <p>Para. 19.2 should set out in detail the quantity of residential development, where on the site it will be met and how the proposal will be promoted.</p> <p>Section 20 fails to reach any conclusion about the nature and scale of housing provision.</p> <p>Support conclusions made about housing need for Harbury and Ladbroke.</p> <p>The Masterplan should identify potential reserve sites to meeting housing need.</p> <p>Section on energy efficiency (Section 28) could be more specific. In particular, there may be scope to deploy advanced energy efficiency technologies on the site. Development on the site should be quantified to inform decision on this. It is unfortunate that Fig 66 illustrates a wind turbine, since</p>	<p>It is acceptable to include 'the scope of the site to meet local housing needs of Bishops Itchington' in the list of opportunities.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the site is a large site. However, the brownfield part of the site that has been identified as suitable for development is clearly defined in the Masterplan (see Section 25 and Fig 54).</p> <p>The principle of meeting the housing needs of residents of Bishops Itchington on the site is acceptable if a need is proven and there were local support for it to be met on the site. The scale and type of need should rightly be determined by a housing needs survey of the local area. A housing needs survey has already been carried out for Bishops Itchington and the details are included in Appendix 3. Section 20 makes specific reference to the outcome of this survey. It is not intended to set out the details of this survey in the body of the Masterplan.</p> <p>Local opinion about where the housing needs of Bishops Itchington should be met is an important material consideration. Residents of Bishops Itchington working in partnership with appropriate agencies will need to identify a site that they feel is suitable to meet their housing need. The Parish Plan would be the ideal channel for this exercise. The Harbury Estate is potentially one of many sites that can be supported to meet local housing need for Bishops Itchington.</p> <p>The Masterplan adequately covers the need for energy efficiency and use of renewable energy. However, it is concerned not to be prescriptive at this about what the appropriate technology should be. There are a number of factors to be taken into account which are not known at this stage. It also emphasises that Fig. 66 is only an example.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>this may not necessarily prove to be the most appropriate technology for the site.</p> <p>The Implementation Plan should be specific about timing, funding and who will be responsible for what, in particular on housing.</p> <p>Reference should be made to the importance of putting in place arrangements for post completion evaluation.</p>	<p>At this stage, it will be difficult for the Implementation Plan to determine with certainty what the specific timing for the implementation of specific schemes would be. However, the Masterplan does provide a framework for the sequence of events to happen and how they are interrelated. Furthermore, it specifies what will be required at what time.</p> <p>The importance of post completion evaluation as well as similar other important factors to be taken into account when considering a housing proposal on the site is set out in the Meeting Housing Needs SPD. This SPD is specifically and appropriately referenced in the Masterplan. Singling out one particular factor in the body of the Masterplan may not be helpful.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modifications</b></p> <p><b>Add 'and other adopted strategies, standards and SPDs' to para. 9.10.</b></p> <p><b>Add 'the scope of the site to meet the housing needs of Bishops Itchington' to the list of opportunities in Section 7.</b></p> <p><b>Make reference to the 'Meeting Housing Needs SPD' in the last sentence of para 20.1.</b></p>
17	Warwickshire Police	Have no specific comments on the Masterplan. However, it is aware of concerns of local sergeant about youths using the area for swimming in the lakes and the riding of motor cycles. Officers are therefore	The Council is fully aware of this current problem at the site. Decisions about Section 106 Agreements including their appropriateness and coverage will be resolved during the planning application stage of the development process. In assessing this, the Council will

<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>	<b>District Council's Proposed Response</b>
		concerned about the health and safety issues relating to activities on the site. A Section 106 Agreement as part of the development of the site secured to employ a park ranger may be appropriate	be concerned to ensure that the requirements of Circular 05/2005 are adhered to.  No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.
18	Rosemary Eld	Accept that the site would be developed. Any development over and above what planning permission has been granted should be resisted because it will be out of character with the rural area.  Traffic volume in the locality could be exacerbated by further development to the detriment of the pleasant rural area.  Would support the development of the site for tourism purposes with increase access for residents by means of footpath SM84 being upgraded to a bridal way.	The principle of development of the site for the specific uses detailed in Policy CTY.20 has already been defined in the Local Plan. However, for a proposal to be acceptable a number of conditions specified in the Masterplan should be met.  The traffic impact of development traffic will be assessed through a transport assessment to be agreed by the Highways Agency and the County Council. If the impacts were found to be unacceptable and cannot be mitigated, planning permission would be refused.  The recreational uses on the site are appropriate and well emphasised in the context of the Masterplan.  No modification is proposed as a result of the representation.
19	Kevin Yates	Would like to commend on the excellent work contained in the Masterplan. Support the Masterplan, because no specific housing proposal has been included, in particular on land at North East side Station Road.	The Masterplan is clear to emphasise that residential development of the site will be restricted to that which is designed to meet the identified needs of Bishops Itchington and supported by the local residents of the village to be met on the site.  No modification is proposed as a result of the representation.
20	Thames Water Property Services	No comments to make	No response.
21	Highways Agency	Main sustainable development and transport related issues covered in the Masterplan addresses the concerns of the Highways	No further response is required.

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Agency. In particular, the requirement for Transport Assessment (TA) is critical to the development of the site and it commends SDC for including that in the list of requirements. The Transport Assessment should be in line with guidance published by Department for Transport in March 2007. It also welcomes the pedestrian and cycle routes proposed as part of the development of the site. Finally, it welcomes the requirement for a Travel Plan.</p>	
22	Steve Potts	<p>Support the Masterplan because it provides a sustainable framework for developing the brownfields elements of the site. See no need to develop any where else except where planning permission has already been granted.</p> <p>The Masterplan should go further to restrict any house building to the brownfield element of the site. Any development that will detrimentally affect nearby settlements should be resisted. The non-brownfield element could be turned into a country park.</p>	<p>The Masterplan is clear to emphasise that employment development of the site should be restricted to the brownfield element of the site. It is the brownfield element of the site and the reinstatement of the railway that form the key advantages for developing the site for the proposed use.</p> <p>Any residential development of the site should be specifically designed to meet the housing needs of Bishops Itchington. Local preference about where their housing needs should be met will be a significant material consideration. Ideally, the Parish Plan for the area should indicate preference for the location of housing needs. SDC will work with local people to identify a site to meet their needs. A bottom up rather than a top down approach is favoured by SDC in this particular regard.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.</p>
23	Sue Roderick	<p>The Masterplan is a comprehensive document and represents the best way forward. Would like to register support as a resident of Bishops Itchington.</p>	<p>No further response is required.</p>
24	Simon Wilkinson	<p>Masterplan is comprehensive and sets to give</p>	<p>The impact of the amount and type of development</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>a proportionate view for consideration during any proposed development.</p> <p>The impact of the amount and type of traffic is a significant concern. Existing traffic problems should be emphasised in the Masterplan. Existing traffic measures have little or no effect.</p> <p>Any housing development should be limited to the M40 side of the village.</p> <p>Although outside the scope of the Masterplan, consideration should be given to the development of a village centre, improvements to parking and landscaping in the village, protection the oldest parts of the village by restricting access.</p>	<p>traffic will be fully assessed by the require Transport Assessment as part of development of the site. The assessment will also consider noise, and other environmental impacts of traffic. If the impacts are such that they cannot be mitigated and are unacceptable, that in itself could be a reason for refusing the planning application.</p> <p>The location of any housing needs of the village is one to be influenced by the local community themselves. Any preference should be determined through the local decision making process. The District Council will be working with the Parish Council and other relevant agencies to identify a site to meet local housing need. That process is more bottom-up than top-down.</p> <p>Other matters are outside the scope of the Masterplan. However, if the Council sees any merit to secure contribution towards these schemes, it would do so, taken into account the provisions of Circular 05/2005.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of the representation.</p>
25	Andy F Graves	<p>Leisure uses should be limited to prevent jet skiing.</p> <p>Folletts latest news letter gives a different figure for the housing need for Bishops Itchington.</p>	<p>The site has planning permission for water sport activities. The Council will seek to ensure that the environmental standards associated with that permission are met, but that is outside the remit of the Masterplan.</p> <p>The Housing Needs Survey of Bishops Itchington is included in Appendix 3. This survey has been adopted by the Parish Council to inform decisions about housing needs in the village. The Council will give significant weight to this information.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Doubtful if Follett can reinstate the rail infrastructure. A Passenger rail station could be a good idea to reduce traffic but passenger numbers would not make the scheme viable.</p>	<p>The onus is on the promoters of the site to demonstrate that conditions for the reinstatement of the rail and its active use is met. The Council does not believe that a passenger rail station at this location will be viable.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.</p>
26	Bishops Itchington Parish Council	<p>Masterplan is an excellent document that defines the parameters for any future development of the site. In full agreement that housing should be designed to meet local needs. Detailed comments include:</p> <p>A feasibility study should be carried out as part of the reinstatement of the railhead. The word 'preferably' in para. 27.5.14 should be removed.</p> <p>There should be a caveat to say that diagrams are not detailed plans or alignments and that detailed plans will be submitted as part of any planning application.</p> <p>Masterplan should take into account the public rights of way application made to the County Council.</p>	<p>The Parish Council broadly supports the Masterplan and is in full agreement with the approach adopted on housing provision.</p> <p>The word 'preferably' in para 27.5.14 is appropriate in this context because there could be a number of other ways to demonstrate the commitment of the promoters of the site to the use of the railway.</p> <p>The conditions set out in the Masterplan to support the reinstatement of the rail infrastructure are sufficiently comprehensive and covers all elements of feasibility.</p> <p>It is already accepted that a caveat will be included in the Masterplan to emphasise that at this stage diagrams are indicative and detailed alignments will be agreed at the design stage of the planning application process.</p> <p>The District Council is aware that a formal application has been made to the County Council, seeking legal recognition of numerous informal footpaths within the site. This application has not yet been determined. It is acknowledged that development of the site will have to take account of the outcome of the application. In doing so, the Council will be concerned to ensure that the implementation of the Masterplan is not unduly delayed</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Would support sustainable leisure activities at the Bishops Bowl site for educational purposes for younger people. Facilities to support this could be outdoor pursuit centre.</p>	<p>as a result of this application. Section 27.6 of the Masterplan will be amended to acknowledge the public rights of way application by adding the following sentence: 'The County Council's Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan seeks improvement to existing path network within new development sites and in the surrounding area. In this regard, the potential for improvements to the existing footpath to Harbury and a link between the existing paths to the east and west of the site will be examined. A number of informal footpaths within the site are also claimed to have become public through long usage. An application has been made to the County Council asking that they be formally recognised. Development of the site should take into account the outcome of this application.</p> <p>The use of the site for recreation and educational purposes is well emphasised.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modification:</b></p> <p><b>Add the following sentence to Section 27.6 - 'The County Council's Countryside Access and Rights of Way Improvement Plan seeks improvement to existing path network within new development sites and in the surrounding area. In this regard, the potential for improvements to the existing footpath to Harbury and a link between the existing paths to the east and west of the site will be examined. A number of informal footpaths within the site are also claimed to have become public through long usage. An application has been made to the County Council asking that they be formally recognised. Development of the site should take into account this application'.</b></p>
27	Ladbroke Parish Council	Would like to compliment SDC for producing a very workable document.	

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Would like the main access point shown in Fig.60 to be deleted. Parish Council concerned about the traffic effect on the Domesday Village of Ladbroke with its many listed buildings and old protected trees.</p>	<p>This matter has already been dealt with. It has been recommended that the red arrow be deleted.</p>
28	Peter Fisher	<p>Recent increase in traffic volume is a major concern in the locality. In particular, Deppers Bridge is vulnerable because all properties have frontages to the B4451. Current traffic mitigation measures have not had significant impact. Any development that will exacerbate this condition will not be welcomed.</p> <p>Storage and distribution has been accepted as suitable use on the site with no account given to similar uses in Southam and Fenny Compton.</p> <p>The railhead can also generate HGV movements in the area.</p> <p>Ecology of the site should be left to regenerate naturally without interference.</p>	<p>Matters relating to traffic impacts have already been addressed. It needs to be emphasised that a Transport Assessment will be carried out as part of development proposal that will come forward. That assessment includes traffic impacts on local roads such as the B4451 and the amenity of nearby residents. If the impacts are found to be unacceptable, the planning permission will not be granted.</p> <p>The site already has planning permission for open storage that was granted on appeal. This permission can be implemented without the Masterplan. The Masterplan provides a framework for controlling the impacts of any further development of the site. The Local Plan defines the acceptable uses on the site if a number of conditions were to be met. The Masterplan has set out in detail what these conditions are.</p> <p>The impacts of HGV movement will be part of the Transport Assessment.</p> <p>There is no doubt that the ecology of the site can be significantly enhanced through the Masterplan proposals. More importantly, it will ensure its use as an educational resource.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
29	RPS on behalf of Follett Property Holdings Ltd	<p>Title of Masterplan should be changed to Harbury Estate.</p> <p>Format of Masterplan is confusing and should have major headings.</p> <p>Figures will benefit from titles and annotations.</p> <p>Delete everything after sustainable in para 1.1 and insert new second bullet point to read 'comprehensively planned'.</p> <p>In para 3.3 line 2 delete the word requirements and replace with suggested elements.</p> <p>Delete the word agreement and replace with obligations in para 3.3.</p> <p>Para 5.3 – delete first bullet point and replace with 'a clear understanding of significant development impacts'.</p> <p>Para 5.4 delete 'in an unsustainable location' and replace with 'is in a relatively unsustainable location in its current state and in the context'.</p> <p>Para 6.2 – after the words towards insert 'some or all' and delete the word 'addressing'.</p>	<p>Title of Masterplan reflects title of Policy in the Local Plan. To avoid confusion, it is important that they are consistent.</p> <p>The current structure offers coherency and ease of understanding in the thought process.</p> <p>Matter already dealt with above. It is recommended that figures be annotated.</p> <p>Vision statement as proposed to be modified presents a clear aspiration for the site.</p> <p>The word requirement is appropriate in this context and so are the words Section 106 Agreement.</p> <p>First bullet point is appropriate in this context. It represents the intention of what is sought.</p> <p>Council maintains that the site is in an unsustainable location in the context of the spatial strategy of the Local Plan. Its current state has nothing to do with its unsustainable location.</p> <p>The word 'addressing' should be retained because it expresses the intention of the Masterplan in dealing with the issues. However, it is true that the proposals in the Masterplan might not address all the challenges and the addition of the words 'some or all' after 'addressing' is reasonable.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Bishops Itchington does not lack bus services. The word main in sentence need clarification.</p> <p>Under constraints – delete 'dictate' in second bullet point and insert 'influence'. Delete fourth bullet point because it is not clear why it is a constraint. Delete sixth bullet point as traffic impacts are not known.</p> <p>Para 9.8 – add new sentence 'any further significant provision of employment land for general industrial use that is not designed to meet an identified local need will be considered contrary to the current Development Plan.</p> <p>Para 9.9 – delete 'specifically' because whilst the emphasises may be on meeting local needs it is not solely the position as it is only development which is more than significant that should be captured by local needs test.</p> <p>Remove grid from Map 1 and clarify location of Great Crested Newts (GCN) breeding ponds.</p> <p>Para 12.1 line 1 – insert after the word 'any' the words 'significant development'.</p> <p>Rearrange Figures 32 and 35 to achieve better relationship with text. Para 13.6 – delete reference to Fig 32 and make reference to Fig this figure on page 20 instead.</p>	<p>The Council maintains that there is lack of bus services in the area by reason of their frequency, timing and availability with respect to need.</p> <p>Use of the word 'influence' instead of 'dictate' will not undermine the intent of the Masterplan and is acceptable. The fourth bullet is a constraint in respect of employment to meet local needs. Sixth bullet should be retained. The current situation is well documented.</p> <p>Policy COM.1 is very clear. It is about development to meet identified local need and not development to cater for need above locally identified need but which is not significant.</p> <p>See comment above.</p> <p>GCN breeding ponds are already identified on Map 1. This will be further emphasised.</p> <p>The site is ecologically very sensitive and it is critical that the full effects of any development are comprehensively assessed. Wording should be retained.</p> <p>The suggested rearrangement of the diagrams will offer a better relationship of the diagrams to the text and is acceptable.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Page 20 – Area C – delete words ‘major priority’ and insert considered in any redevelopment proposal’. In Area D – delete third and fourth subsection to be reworded as ‘landscaping measures to reduce the visual impact of the substation itself will be encouraged’. Area H – last sentence finish the sentence after the words assets of the site and delete rest of sentence.</p> <p>Page 22 Area M – delete penultimate sentence because it presupposes the significance of landscape without proper evaluation. The landscape of the site does not benefit from any designation and so does not warrant protection per se from a landscape perspective</p> <p>Para 14.1 makes little sense and can be subsumed with appropriate amendments into Section 15.</p> <p>Specific Landscape Proposals should change to ‘strategy for protection, enhancement and mitigation.</p> <p>Fig 38 should show potential local housing need sites. The Plan anticipates development in these areas and that is why the pedestrian routes are drawn.</p> <p>Para 17.4 – needs initial capitals and is incomplete in parts.</p> <p>Figure 44 – The CLEUD areas could be annotated not only for the employment but</p>	<p>The wording for Areas C, D and H represents the intentions of the Masterplan in the context that they are made and should be retained.</p> <p>The significance of the quality of the landscape is emphasised in the Masterplan. It contributes to the variety and form of the immediate environs and the landscape of the locality. It does not need to be designated for its quality and importance to be appreciated.</p> <p>Section 14 is a precursor to Section 15 and should be reworded to emphasise that. The specific landscape proposals are indeed a strategy for protection, enhancement and mitigation. The rewording will reflect this.</p> <p>The location of housing on the site or indeed any other location to meet local need is one that needs to be influenced by local people in accordance with Policy COM.1. It would be presumptuous to specify a use that may or not be accommodated on the site. Initial capitals are acceptable editorial changes.</p> <p>The CLEUD granted on appeal was specific to a defined area for a defined use and should remain as such.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>also the water sports.</p> <p>The Section should also refer to previous planning approvals which are no longer extant. In particular, areas beyond the defined brownfield element of the site that previously had planning permission but no longer extant should be included in the developable area.</p> <p>Para 19.1 second line – remove the word detail as this has not been achieved.</p> <p>Para 19.1 and 19.3 in the view of RPS is incorrect interpretation of policy.</p> <p>Disagree with commentary on level of housing need on page 28. Believe that the Housing Needs Survey produced by David Coutie Associates both in terms of how and where housing needs should be met is the only authoritative evidence based research available.</p> <p>Para. 21.1 - Requirement to build development to carbon neutral standard is potentially unreasonable and should qualify by the words 'where possible'.</p> <p>Section on hotel and lodges should make clear that first and foremost any hotel needs to comply with CTY20. Policy COM.21 is then a material consideration following a</p>	<p>Watersports was not part of the CLEUD.</p> <p>Proposals are determined in the context of current planning policies. The basis upon which permissions were granted in the past might not apply in the current context. It would be wrong to assume that past permissions which are no longer extant should apply in determining uses on the site and/or where they should be located.</p> <p>Acceptable uses are already defined in Policy CTY.20. Masterplan clarifies in detail these uses and how they will be implemented. Wording should be retained. Both paragraphs are a correct interpretation of Policies CTY.20 and COM.1 and should be retained.</p> <p>Housing Needs Survey carried out by David Coutie Associates is not authoritative based on the comments received and is not the only survey carried out to inform the Masterplan. The Council working in partnership with Warwickshire Rural Community Council and Bishops Itchington Parish Council has carried out an up to date Housing Needs Survey. The outcome of the survey has been adopted by the Parish Council and is in Appendix 3 of the Masterplan.</p> <p>The Council has an adopted SPD for promoting renewable energy in development. All efforts will be made to achieve carbon neutral development on the site. However, it is reasonable to accept the proposed changes for the possibility of not meeting this aspiration.</p> <p>The importance of Policy COM.21 in assessing hotel use of the site cannot be underplayed. Policy CTY.20 refers to the need to justify any further recreational/tourism use of the site. The appropriate policy to assess any</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>compliance or otherwise with CTY20.</p> <p>Section on general industrial uses to meet identified local need should acknowledge the existence of the employment CLEUD and how this may relate to the provision of general industrial uses on the site.</p> <p>Para 24.1 line 3 – insert 'beyond that which would be considered significant at a strategic level' after the words 'on the site'</p> <p>Para 24.5 – delete the last two sentences on this paragraph as there is no alternative site test set out in Policy CTY.20</p> <p>Fig 58 should relate to the possibility of residential development at the Southern edge of the site.</p> <p>Para 27.3.1 – insert 'significant' after 'a'.</p> <p>Para 27.3.2 second to last line – delete the words 'an agreed' and the rest of the sentence after transport assessment.</p> <p>Para 27.3.3 line 1 – delete 'is likely to' after additional traffic and then insert 'over and above that currently approved or permitted, may'. Also insert 'and lead to' after 'verge</p>	<p>need is Policy COM.21. It is very important that this is emphasised. Section should be retained.</p> <p>The CLEUD was granted for a specific use to be accommodated at a specific location on the site. That decision was not based on local need but a legal technicality of what that part of the site was used for in the past. Section should be retained.</p> <p>Suggested wording is contrary to the intention of Policies CTY.20 and COM.1 and should not be accepted.</p> <p>Policy COM.1 does not give exclusive rights for local employment needs to be met on this particular site. Local people can identify an alternative site which may be more sustainable to meet their needs. This needs to be emphasised.</p> <p>Matter already addressed above.</p> <p>Wording is appropriate in its context and should be retained.</p> <p>It is unlikely that the District Council will support a TA based on a methodology and outcome that is being contested by the Highways Agency and the County Council who are the key consultative body on transport. It will be helpful to include the names of these bodies to further clarify the paragraph. Apart from that the sentence should be retained.</p> <p>Current traffic situation/impacts are well documented and articulated by interested parties. Any additional traffic is likely to increase the existing levels in the locality. Comment reflects the intention of the</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>over running'.</p> <p>CTY.20 does not require the reinstatement of the railway infrastructure.</p> <p>Para 27.5.4 – insert 'rail related after 'application for'.</p> <p>Para 27.5.7 – insert at end of sentence 'all that associated with certificate of lawful use area'.</p> <p>Ditto remarks for para. 27.5.11 and 27.5.13.</p> <p>Page 44 – Fishermen's lodges should be changed to lodges. This section needs to cater not only for extant planning permission for fishermen's lodges but also the potential for further lodges that may or not be related to an end user such as fishermen.</p> <p>Para 31.9 – delete third sentence as development could be local needs, not significant in scale or relate to CLEUD land.</p> <p>Section on Management Plan should reflect that there should be more than one management plan depending on the number and scale of planning applications that may be made. It is acknowledged that individual management plans that may cover smaller areas must relate to and be consistent with the plan for the larger area.</p> <p>Implementation Plan needs to recognise that</p>	<p>Masterplan.</p> <p>Policy CTY.20 does require the reinstatement of the railway. See paragraphs 7.50.11 and 7.50.4 of the Local Plan Review. Comment is therefore incorrect.</p> <p>Text in Masterplan reflects the intention of what is sought.</p> <p>The paragraph refers to uses that will require planning permission. The use associated with the Certificate of Lawful use already has planning approval.</p> <p>There is repetition and paragraph 27.5.13 should be deleted.</p> <p>Current evidence would support Fishermen's lodges which presently have the benefit of planning approval. The Masterplan is clear to emphasise that further lodges for whatever use can only be justified in the context of the relevant policies of the Local Plan Review. Heading should be retained.</p> <p>Sentence reflects the intention of the Masterplan and should be retained.</p> <p>The Council will seek to ensure that a comprehensive Management Plan is prepared and secured with any planning application for further development of the site because of the interrelationship between habitats and the environmental assets of the site. Implementation of aspects of the Management Plan can be phased based on a specific planning approval if it is considered possible and appropriate.</p> <p>The Implementation Plan does recognise that there</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>there may be more than one application made on the site.</p> <p>Table 1 Badgers – reword first sentence as follows 'Badgers utilise part of the Bishops Bowl Lakes site for foraging' delete second sentence as 2007 badger survey shows that there is no active main badger sett within the site.</p> <p>Third box last line – delete will and replace with may.</p> <p>Fourth box – delete subject to other policies of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Sixth box delete COM.21 and insert CTY.20</p> <p>Seventh box fourth line – delete will and insert may.</p>	<p>could be more than one planning application. What it does is to establish relationships between various potential applications. It should be retained as worded</p> <p>Latest evidence provided by RPS to inform the Masterplan confirmed that the Badger survey carried out identified the presence of one active main sett and two outlier setts on the site. Two further disused setts were also identified (see Ecology Working Paper para 2.23).</p> <p>Management Plan will be required and therefore sentence is necessary to be retained.</p> <p>Relevant policies will apply and for that matter sentence should be retained.</p> <p>Policy COM.21 is critical to assessing the hotel use of the site and therefore sentence should be retained.</p> <p>The reinstatement of the railway line will be a pre-requisite and for that matter sentence should be retained.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modifications:</b></p> <p><b>Add 'some or all' after addressing in para 6.2.</b></p> <p><b>Replace dictate with influence in Section 7 under constraints (bullet point 2).</b></p> <p><b>Replace Fig 32 with Fig 35, Fig 33 with 32. Delete Fig 33. Reference to Fig 32 in para 13.6 and make reference to this figure on page 20.</b></p> <p><b>Section 14 be reworded as a precursor to Section 15. Title of Section 15 'Specific Landscape</b></p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
			<p><b>Proposals' be deleted.</b></p> <p><b>Para 17.4 – sentence should begin with capital letters.</b></p> <p><b>Insert the words 'where possible' after 'standards' in para 21.1.</b></p>
30	Pam Reason	The Masterplan reflects the ecological sensitivity of the area and would like to support it. Development, if necessary should only be because the surrounding villages want and need it.	No further comment is required.
31	Amanda Smith (English Heritage)	No comments to make at this stage. But note that the Cottage at Station Road, Bishops Itchington is Grade 11* (not Grade 11)	<p>Suggestion is factual and acceptable. Masterplan will be amended to reflect that.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modification</b></p> <p><b>Grade II in para 10.7.3 should be Grade II*</b></p>
32	Patrick Tanner	<p>The Council has recognised the uniqueness of the site. Every opportunity must be taken to capitalise on its potential. Affordable housing needs of Bishops Itchington should be seen in the context of the Harbury Estate.</p> <p>The site should also meet the needs of the wider area. For example, it should meet the affordable housing needs of Harbury and Ladbroke. Council dogmatic approach to housing development should be reviewed.</p>	<p>The Masterplan seeks to explore the potential for sustainable development of the site. The scope for meeting the affordable housing needs of Bishops Itchington on the site is acceptable in principle if it is supported by the local people themselves.</p> <p>Residents of Harbury are already pursuing a site to meet their housing needs and note your objection to this site. The Council takes the view that Ladbroke is too detached from the site for their affordable housing needs to be met there.</p> <p>The Council is reviewing Local Plan in the form of the Local Development Framework. This will provide scope for consideration of the existing housing policies of the Council.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.</p>
33	Icetone Systems	Broadly sympathetic to the aims of the	No further response required.

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
	Limited	Masterplan and its ethos, in particular, the approach taken to restrict housing on the site. The site is not suitable for large scale housing development.	
34	Cindy Musgrave	<p>Local Agenda 21 is encouraged to see that the Council is recognising the importance of the ecological assets of the site. Landscaping measures should be consistent with measures to safeguard ecology. There should be long term management plan for the ecological assets of the site.</p> <p>The site should become an ecological tourist attraction with an expansion of lodges to form the focus of development of the site.</p> <p>A lodge style hotel could be built to attract families and groups.</p> <p>Cycle tracks and nature trails should be promoted</p> <p>Design of buildings should be holistic with the environment and carbon neutral. The site must use renewable energy source for energy supply.</p> <p>Craft workshops, artisan bakery are example of light industrial activities that should be accommodated on the site.</p> <p>Hotel could be used for conferences and seminars.</p>	<p>The Masterplan ensures that landscape proposals do not undermine the ecology of the site. It requires a Management Plan to be prepared for the long term management of the ecological, geological and landscape assets of the site.</p> <p>The tourism and educational value of the ecology of the site is adequately emphasised. Similarly, the proposals in the Masterplan include a network of cycle and pedestrian routes.</p> <p>The Masterplan does not rule out a hotel or further lodges on the site provided they are proven in accordance with the relevant policies of the Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Masterplan includes a network of pedestrian and cycle routes.</p> <p>The need to encourage the use of renewable energy and carbon neutral development is adequately covered in the Masterplan and/or dealt with in this report.</p> <p>The nature and type of light industrial activities to go on the site should be determined by local employment needs in accordance with the provisions of Policy COM.1 of the LPR. Beyond that employment development should be related to the reinstatement of the railway line.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>An area has been designated for affordable housing but no requirement for housing has been demonstrated.</p> <p>Support the reinstatement of the railhead.</p> <p>Proposals will bring social, economic and environmental benefits to South Warwickshire.</p>	<p>The Masterplan does not earmark any area for residential development because that is locally driven.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.</p>
35	Natural England	<p>Natural England's comments are structured on paragraph by paragraph basis. It is not intended to list the paragraphs that they wish to support.</p> <p>Legibility of diagrams needs to be improved</p> <p>Some photos will benefit from captions</p> <p>Many Plans/diagrams are not legible.</p> <p>Masterplan will benefit from further explanation about how ecological factors have influenced decisions in the Masterplan</p> <p>Masterplan will benefit if the three areas in paragraph 10.7 is shown on a Map.</p> <p>Map 1 is legible but red target note numbers can be removed.</p> <p>Yellow line on Fig 31 needs explanation and colours need to be distinct from each other.</p> <p>Objects to environmental integration/buffer at west of the dashed yellow lines across Greenhill Lake.</p>	<p>Effort will be made to improve legibility. It should however be emphasised that the Masterplan is in an A3 format and it very clear in that format. Comments about providing captions to diagrams are already accepted.</p> <p>This is adequately covered in the Masterplan (see Section 25). It needs to be emphasised that there are other influential factors to the Masterplan.</p> <p>A diagram will be included to demonstrate this.</p> <p>Point noted.</p> <p>Yellow line will be deleted and therefore no explanation is required.</p> <p>Comment is noted and the environmental integration and buffer proposal will be deleted to avoid any adverse impact on biodiversity.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Area H of Section 13 does not appear on Fig 32. Areas B and G identify the same pink zone.</p> <p>Fig 35 should be brought forward in the document to match its associated text.</p> <p>Fig 33 is not introduced in the text.</p> <p>Second and third sentences of Area H on Page 21 should be replaced with the following: 'The existing grassland with scattered scrub should be managed to retain about 10% cover of scrub of varying ages, along with improved marginal habitats such as reed beds at the lake edges.</p> <p>Last sentence of Area I does not relate well with the rest of the paragraph.</p> <p>Area L – should emphasise the need to protect ecological features on the site.</p> <p>Agricultural areas north of the former cement works and north of the Voysey Cottage is not included for any landscape prescription.</p> <p>Third sentence of Area 6 on page 23 can be deleted. Final sentence of Area 7 (page 23) should be deleted and add to Area 8.</p> <p>Explanation to Area 8 (page 24) should be replaced by the following paragraph: The existing grassland with scattered scrub</p>	<p>Point noted. Labelling of Area H is an editorial omission that will be corrected.</p> <p>Point noted and considered acceptable because it will ensure better relationship between text and diagram.</p> <p>It is suggested that diagrams be rearranged to ensure better relationship between text and diagrams. Suggested wording will ensure better ecological management of the site</p> <p>Accepted editorial error and last sentence should be deleted.</p> <p>Sentence will be reworded to emphasise that any access proposal should take into account the geological and ecological interest of the Mound.</p> <p>The importance of the landscape of the site in its wider context in the locality has been adequately covered.</p> <p>Acceptable because deletion will not undermine intention of Masterplan. Suggested change is acceptable because it will not undermine the intention of the Masterplan.</p> <p>Suggested change in wording will enhance biodiversity of the site and should be accepted.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>should be managed to retain about 10% cover of scrub of varying ages, along with improved water margin tree species, for example Willow, that will overhang the water's edge and reduce the apparent scale of the water body.</p> <p>Final sentence of Section 15 refers to a Management Plan. What it does is require a Management Plan to be prepared.</p> <p>Fig 44 should use a thicker line to define the area for open storage.</p> <p>It questions whether the absence of the Housing Needs Survey will affect the consultation process.</p> <p>It will help if Fig 52 – 54 were annotated to demonstrate how it was done.</p> <p>Additional line to the definition of the area for open storage needs to be explained.</p> <p>Fig 64 should emphasise that ecology will not be adversely affected by the networks.</p> <p>Does the last sentence of paragraph 28.5 refer to existing development?</p> <p>Fencing in Fig 67 may not be appropriate for ecological reasons.</p> <p>Para, 31.1 repeats para 30.1.</p>	<p>Sentence refers to the principles that should guide the preparation of a Management Plan. It should therefore be modified to reflect that.</p> <p>Comments noted. Line will be thickened to enhance legibility.</p> <p>Absence of the Housing Needs Survey will have no impact on the details of the Masterplan. It provides information of what is needed.</p> <p>Comment already dealt with.</p> <p>Additional line is clearly defined. It represents the brownfield element of the site.</p> <p>Acceptable to have a caveat that seeks to protect the environmental asset of the site, not only ecology but also geology and landscape.</p> <p>Yes.</p> <p>Fig 67 is only an example of a water management feature. The Council was keen to emphasise that it does not wish to be prescriptive at this stage.</p> <p>Editorial error to be corrected. Para. 30.1 will be deleted to avoid the repetition.</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>Figs 68 and 69 are not referred to in the text.</p> <p>Is reference to leisure lodges in para. 31.8 same as Fisherman's lodges.</p> <p>Consideration should be given to green roofs in view of their benefits.</p> <p>Leisure and recreation in Table 2 should also make reference to a Management Plan.</p>	<p>Contents page is clear to emphasise that not all the photos are referenced in the text.</p> <p>Reference should be Fishermen's lodges and Masterplan should be amended to reflect that.</p> <p>Design of buildings will be made to fit its purpose and the character of the locality. This will be considered as part of the design stage of the planning application process.</p> <p>Reference to a Management Plan here is important to safeguard the environmental assets of the site and to be consistent with the other proposals of the Masterplan.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modifications:</b></p> <p><b>Include a diagram to demonstrate para 10.7.</b></p> <p><b>Delete yellow lines on Fig 31 and make colours more distinctive. Also delete environmental integration and buffer proposal from Map.</b></p> <p><b>Include Area H on Fig 32.</b></p> <p><b>Second and third sentences of Area H on page 21 should be deleted and replaced with 'The existing grassland with scattered scrub should be managed to retain about 10% cover of scrub of varying ages, along with improved marginal habitats such as reed beds at the lake edges'.</b></p> <p><b>Last sentence under Area I be deleted (page 21).</b></p> <p><b>Add the following to Area L 'any access proposal should take into account the geological and</b></p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
			<p><b>ecological interest of the site'.</b></p> <p><b>Delete third sentence of Area 6 on page 23.</b></p> <p><b>Delete final sentence of Area 7 (page 23) and add sentence to Area 8.</b></p> <p><b>Explanation to Area 8 (page 24) be deleted and replaced with 'The existing grassland with scattered scrub should be managed to retain about 10% cover of scrub of varying ages, along with improved water margin tree species, for example Willow, that will overhang the water's edge and reduce the apparent scale of the water body'.</b></p> <p><b>Add 'The key strategic principles for' in front of the last sentence of Section 15.</b></p> <p><b>Improve lines on Fig 44.</b></p> <p><b>Add the following caveat to Fig 64 'The provision of pedestrian and cycle routes should take account of the environmental assets of the site.</b></p> <p><b>Delete para. 30.1.</b></p> <p><b>Reference to 'leisure lodges' in para 31.8 should be deleted and be replaced with Fishermen's Lodges'.</b></p> <p><b>Add the following to Table 2 under leisure and recreation 'A Landscape, Ecology and Geology Management Plan will be required as part of a planning application'.</b></p>
36	Anna Swift - County	Some Plans can be more legible	The Masterplan document is in A3 format and accepts

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
	Ecologist	<p>Paragraph 10.7 can benefit from having a Map.</p> <p>Figure 31 needs explanation.</p> <p>Landscape proposal should take account of ecological interest. For example, drainage may not be appropriate in Area B in Section 13.</p> <p>Area B and H of Section 13 needs to be reconciled.</p> <p>No additional planting is likely to be required in Areas 6 and 14 (Section 13)</p> <p>Figures 55 and 56 may not fit this landscape. Fig 67 appear to have a fenced off pond area which is likely to restrict the movement of protected species.</p> <p>Welcome the requirement for detailed ecology, landscape and geology Management Plan.</p> <p>Natural England's comments Area 8 of</p>	<p>that some of the images on the website might not be too clear. However, opportunity has been granted for people to have hard copies of the document if they wish. The Council will do its best to improve the quality of the images for the final product when they are put on the website.</p> <p>Matter already dealt with.</p> <p>Fig 31 has explanatory text attached. The yellow marks that divide the various zones will be deleted to avoid any wrong interpretation of its purpose. Similar, for the same reason, the words buffer area and drainage will be deleted.</p> <p>It is reasonable to emphasise that no additional planting may be required within areas 6 and 14 of Section 13.</p> <p>Figures 55, 56 and 67 are just examples and the Masterplan is clear to emphasise that. Appropriate schemes will be determined at the design stage of the development control process. Natural England's comments on Area 8 have been taken into account.</p> <p><b>Proposed Modification</b>  <b>Insert a Map showing the classification of the site as expressed in Para. 10.7</b></p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		Section 13 should be considered.	<p><b>Delete yellow marks and the words buffer areas from Fig. 31.</b></p> <p><b>Delete reference to additional planting in Areas 6 and 14 of Section 13.</b></p> <p><b>Reconcile Areas B and H of Section 13.</b></p>
37	Neal Gardner – Capital and Property Projects Officer (WCC)	<p>Will have insufficient accommodation for pupils that might come from any relevant residential units.</p> <p>Any Section 106 Agreements should include the standard formula for education.</p>	The Council seek to ensure that Section 106 agreements adequately cover all relevant impacts of the redevelopment of the site. In assessing this, the Council will be concerned to ensure that the requirements of Circular 05/2005 are adhered to.
38	Harbury Society (Linda Ridgley)	<p>Congratulate the Council for completing such a difficult task trying to marry the demands of developers with the desires of local people whilst also protecting the heritage and ecology of the site.</p> <p>Pleased to see that there is an imperative to ensure that development does not compromise the heritage, geology and ecology of the site.</p> <p>Emphasis on mitigating traffic impacts of development is welcome.</p> <p>There should be public access to the site from Harbury and is disappointed that this is not part of the Masterplan.</p> <p>Wish to see a commitment to heritage, ecological and geological interpretation of the site.</p>	<p>Matter already dealt with. It is recommended that the Masterplan takes into account the public rights of way application.</p> <p>The Masterplan comprehensively covers the ecological, geological and heritage value of the site for how it can be interpreted for public educational and recreational</p>

Reference Number	Consultee	Summary of representations	District Council's Proposed Response
		<p>The potential disadvantage of traffic and noise should be balanced by benefits of access and information for residents.</p> <p>There should be business plan for the management, interpretation and enhancement of potential fishing lodges and other leisure facilities. The history of the site should be celebrated.</p> <p>The proprietary interest of local people with the site should be acknowledged. Local people want access to the site and to enjoy its wildlife.</p>	<p>uses without being too prescriptive about details of specific schemes (see Sections 17 and 12).</p> <p>The Council will be concerned to ensure that the impacts of development traffic are adequately mitigated. Development that will lead to adverse traffic impacts which cannot be mitigated is likely to be refused. The need for the environmental assets of the site to be accessible for public educational and recreational uses is well emphasised in the Masterplan.</p> <p>These are operational matters that can be resolved as a matter of detail outside the Masterplan process.</p> <p>The Masterplan adequately promotes local access to the site for recreational, ecological and geological purposes.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of this representation</p>
39	Harbury Parish Paths Partnership (John Ridgley)	<p>Congratulate the Council for a balanced approach to the development of a complicated site with competing pressures but also much potential.</p> <p>Masterplan should safeguard four claimed public rights of way across the site, include a new public bridleway passing through the site, and safeguard a claimed village green within the site. Masterplan should also give greater emphasis to the development potential of the site for planned informal recreation.</p>	<p>The issue regarding the claimed public rights of way application has already been dealt with in the report. Similarly, the suggested proposal for bridleway has also been dealt with. It is recommended that reference be made in the Masterplan to acknowledge the public rights of way application.</p> <p>There is no formal application for a claimed Village Green within the site. It is therefore not intended to include this in the Masterplan. The recreational use of</p>

<b>Reference Number</b>	<b>Consultee</b>	<b>Summary of representations</b>	<b>District Council's Proposed Response</b>
			<p>the site has adequately been covered.</p> <p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation.</p>
40	M. L. Menzler (Open Space Society)	Wanted to know how proposed highway system accommodates the route of footpath SM197. Made request for a hard copy of Masterplan to inform his comments.	<p>Copy was sent but did not come back with any comments.</p> <p>No modification is proposed as a result of this representation.</p>
41	Gordon Smith	Draft Masterplan makes no reference to the application for footpaths across the site. It is a material consideration to be taken into account.	<p>This matter has been dealt. It is recommended that reference be made in the Masterplan to acknowledge the public rights of way application.</p> <p>No further modification is proposed as a result of this representation.</p>