

THE CABINET  
20 JULY 2015

**Subject:** Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy –  
response to Inspector's Interim Conclusions

**Lead Officer:** Dave Nash  
*Contact on 01789 260399*

**Lead Member/  
Portfolio Holder:** Councillor C Saint

---

### Summary

This report presents to members the modifications to the Core Strategy that are proposed in response to the interim conclusions arising from the independent examination.

### Recommendations to Council

- (1) That the 'Review of the Objectively Assessed Housing Need' (ERM), the 'Meeting the Housing Requirement: Options Analysis' report (SDC), the 'Stratford-on-Avon Strategic Transport Assessment: Further Focused Assessment of Development Options' (Vectos for WCC) and the 'Sustainability Appraisal of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy: Post Inspector's Interim Conclusions Interim SA Report' (Lepus Consulting) be received as evidence to support the Core Strategy examination process.
  - (2) That the further modifications to the submitted Core Strategy as identified in the attached document be endorsed for formal consideration by the Examination Inspector subsequent to them being published to allow further representations from all interested parties.
  - (3) That the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to endorse the consolidated Sustainability Appraisal report for publication ahead of the representations period, subject to the document subsequently being referred to The Cabinet for formal adoption into the Council's evidence base.
  - (4) That the finalisation of any consequential modifications to the text of the Core Strategy required to ensure consistency with the further modifications endorsed by way of recommendation 2 be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council.
- 

## 1 Background/Information

- 1.1 The Council's Core Strategy will replace the Local Plan Review 2006 and set the strategic planning policies and strategy for development across

the District to 2031. As members are aware, the Core Strategy was submitted for independent examination on 30 September 2014. The appointed inspector, Pete Drew, started his examination of the plan at that point and conducted the examination hearings that were held throughout January 2015. He published his Interim Conclusions on 18 March 2015.

- 1.2 Completion of the examination process is currently held in abeyance pending the further work required as a result of the Interim Conclusions. This has been undertaken in accordance with the process described in the briefing note provided to all members on 18 May. That note summarised the Interim Conclusions and outlined the steps that would be taken in response.
- 1.3 At a special meeting held on 22 June 2015 the Council endorsed a set of consolidated modifications that have arisen from the examination process to date. Nothing has come up as a result of the additional work now completed to suggest that there is a need to consider any further modifications to the policies that were on that date subject to informal adoption for the purposes of development management. This report is very largely focused on the housing policies that are considered necessary to secure a finding that the plan is sound and can be adopted, but it also covers some associated employment land issues.
- 1.4 Prior to their submission for consideration via the examination process, the recommended modifications set out in this report must be opened up to further representations from interested parties. The proposed modifications and any representations submitted concerning them would then all be forwarded for consideration by the Inspector. Subject to a positive resolution from the Council on 20 July, the necessary documents will be finalised ahead of a representations period that is planned to run for 6 weeks from 13 August to 26 September.

## **2 Summary of the further possible modifications**

### **Identifying the Housing Requirement**

- 2.1 The Inspector's Interim Conclusions show that he considers the Council's estimate of a net additional 12,100 jobs being created during the plan period is robust. However, he finds that the demographic-led projection of housing growth (566dpa) would be inadequate to meet this increase in the supply of new jobs. He recommends that the Council should both propose a housing requirement sufficient to accommodate its own projection of additional workers within the District and aim to achieve a better balance in the number of homes and jobs by broadly maintaining the commuting ratio revealed by the 2011 Census. The census shows that there is a small net inflow of commuters, understood to be largely driven by the journeys to JLR at Gaydon.
- 2.2 The Council's principal advisers on this matter are the consultants ERM, although the context set by the Coventry and Warwickshire Joint Strategic Housing Market Assessment (JSHMA) prepared by GL Hearn is the key influence. The Inspector accepts that the Coventry and Warwickshire Housing Market Area is the most relevant HMA for strategic planning purposes within the District. ERM were commissioned to provide a review of the Inspector's Interim Conclusions and specifically to

answer the question he had posed – namely, at what level would the housing requirement need to be set to support the predicted job growth and maintain the 2011 commuting ratio? Their review concludes that the provision of 724dpa (14,480 homes over the plan period) is necessary to meet the Inspector's principal concerns. This is based on a marginally revised demographic projection of 572dpa (taking account of the recently updated Sub National Housing Projections), but including an employment-related uplift of 152dpa. More information is provided in both the summarised conclusions appended to this report (Appendix 1) and the full ERM report published alongside it.

- 2.3 It is important to note that further evidence-based work is being undertaken by GL Hearn on behalf of the Coventry and Warwickshire authorities. This work at the HMA level is being progressed as a matter of urgency following the publication of the Initial Findings reached by the Inspector who is examining the submitted Warwick District Local Plan. That Inspector has concluded that the Warwick plan cannot proceed until the unmet need for housing across the HMA (as identified in the published JSHMA) has been addressed. This unmet need arises from the lack of capacity to accommodate growth within Coventry. The existence of a common boundary between the City of Coventry and Warwick District has clearly influenced the Warwick Inspector to place greater weight on this matter than had our own plan Inspector, notwithstanding the agreement that had been reached collectively by the sub-regional authorities on a process to address the shortfall. In the absence of any further progress, this matter would undoubtedly be raised via further representations on the Stratford Core Strategy. By participating in the commissioning of further urgent work to address the HMA issue, the Council will know prior to the proposed date of submitting its own new proposals whether or not there is any dissonance between the outcome of that further work and the newly proposed requirement of 724dpa.

#### **Meeting the increased housing requirement**

- 2.4 The Council must now establish its strategy to meet the increased housing requirement. The Inspector has given a clear indication that the proposal to accommodate around 2,000 homes in the Local Service Villages as part of a dispersed approach to the distribution of development should not be re-visited. The previously proposed level of development in such settlements is seen by the Inspector as lying at the upper limit of what is reasonable in terms of a sustainable distribution of growth. The Inspector has also made it clear that the Council should take a fresh look at a wider range of strategic options, placing all sites on an even playing field in terms of this new work. As such, in carrying out this fresh analysis the previously agreed allocations at Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath and the Stratford Canal Quarter have not been treated as commitments.
- 2.5 In his Interim Conclusions the Inspector advises that the housing supply must build in some 'headroom' above the requirement figure to allow for the possibility that not all sites will come forward exactly as anticipated. The headroom required is a matter of judgement, but it is felt that it should not be less than 5-7% of the overall figure. This level of headroom would require the identification of capacity for a further 724 to 1,014 homes. The overall target supply figure would thus be in the region of 15,200 to 15,500 (rounded).

- 2.6 There is however a further pre-requisite, namely that upon re-submission the Council is able to show clear evidence that the adoption of the plan will put in place a robust 5 year housing land supply (5YHLS). The absence of evidence to confirm a 5YHLS would render the plan unsound. This consideration suggests that the strategy will have to encompass a range of sites that will guarantee both a steady supply of new homes in the medium to long term and the prospect of additional early delivery that will contribute to 5YHLS. It is likely to mean that the overall target supply will need to sit towards the upper end of the range indicated above.
- 2.7 With all this in mind, your officers have proceeded on the basis that the committed components of supply are those homes completed from April 2011 to date, sites with the benefit of planning permission, the balance of the provision within the LSVs up to a limit of 2,000 and the windfall allowance as endorsed by the Inspector. With work on a new Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment now well advanced, it is considered that a limited additional allowance can be made to include sites from this source. These identified commitments amount to around 9,490 homes, leaving the Council to identify capacity for 5,712 to 6,003 homes.
- 2.8 There is clearly a wide range of options available. The Inspector has steered the Council to meet the revised requirement by looking again at the distribution of development to Stratford-upon-Avon, the Main Rural Centres, Large Rural Brownfield Sites and to the various locations proposed either as new settlements or strategic urban extensions. Officers have conducted a rigorous appraisal of the options, covering a wide range of environmental and physical criteria, seeking to identify the proposals that, in terms of the benefits they would bring, are felt to stand out from the other options. This process is evidenced in the detailed report ('Meeting the Housing Requirement: Options Analysis') attached at Appendix 2.
- 2.9 It should be noted that integral to this process has been an iterative approach to testing the appropriateness of all options via the sustainability appraisal (SA) process. The SA report published at this stage presents the results of the assessment of the sites considered, as well as addressing the Inspector's concerns about the document previously examined. Once the Council has agreed its response to the Interim Conclusions, Lepus Consulting will complete a consolidated SA Report providing a commentary both on the preferred sites (the report must discuss all options considered and explain why the Council has opted for the ones it prefers) and on the policies/area strategies as approved to be modified. This report will be produced in time to be published at the outset of the representations period in August. The Council is asked to authorise the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader, to endorse the final SA for consultation purposes subject to it being subsequently reported to The Cabinet for formal adoption into the evidence base.
- 2.10 The assessment has had full regard to the further Strategic Transport Assessment work commissioned from Warwickshire County Council. A new report explaining the conclusions that can be drawn from what by definition has had to be a relatively high level approach to the assessment of various options is published alongside this report. A key finding in relation to the various strategic development options in the

Stratford area is that the South-East Stratford with an eastern relief road performs most favourably in traffic impact terms. Long Marston Airfield with a south-western relief road performs least favourably, but this is not surprising as it proposes the largest number of dwellings and thus has a greater impact. The options involving either further large-scale development at Meon Vale or the redevelopment of Wellesbourne Airfield do not perform significantly better than the Long Marston Airfield option. This indicates that the delivery of either option would also require the delivery of a relief road. It is evident that, prior to the formal resubmission of evidence to the Planning Inspector, there is likely to be a requirement for a more detailed investigation into the impacts caused by and mitigation required as a result of the Council's preferred development option.

2.11 The outcome of this rigorous process is that the following options are recommended as providing the most appropriate balance and mix of sites:

- Long Marston Airfield (assumed capacity of 3,500 homes, with 2,100 built by 2031)
- Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath (assumed capacity 3,000 homes, with 2,300 built by 2031)
- Canal Quarter Regeneration Zone (assumed capacity 1,000 homes, with 650 built by 2031 of which 82 units now committed at Warwick House.)
- Land off Bishopton Lane, Stratford-upon-Avon (around 450 homes)
- Land off Daventry Road, Southam (around 500 homes)
- Land off Alcester Road, Stratford-upon-Avon (as a component of revised Proposal SUA.2 providing around 65 homes).

2.12 The modifications to the Core Strategy that would run from the allocation of these sites are set out within revised policies CS.15 and CS.16 and the relevant area strategies (see Appendix 3).

#### **Employment related issues**

2.13 The Inspector has to a large degree supported the economic strategy as submitted. He has provisionally endorsed the potential allocation of land to accommodate the expansion of Aston Martin Lagonda at Gaydon – this proposal is set out within the updated draft of Proposal GLH as endorsed by the Council on 15 June and will be open to wider comment as part of the representation process. At its meeting in June The Cabinet asked that the possibility of this expansion being accommodated within the current Gaydon site, re-using brownfield land rather than permitting expansion onto a greenfield site, be investigated. That possibility has been raised with Jaguar Land Rover. The company has confirmed that its own expansion plans are based upon having sole ownership and occupation of the site.

2.14 The main outstanding issue relates to the Inspector's indication that he has not been presented with evidence to show that there are exceptional circumstances to justify the release of land from the Green Belt to facilitate development at Birmingham Road, Stratford-upon-Avon (Proposal SUA.3). This site had been proposed solely to support the

housing-led mixed use redevelopment of the Canal Quarter (SUA.1), with its function being primarily one of accommodating firms wishing to relocate. The Inspector asked the Council to consider Atherstone Airfield as a possible alternative. Whilst in principle this appears to be a far less attractive location for firms wishing to move from the Canal Quarter, particularly given that the most direct access to the principal road network (A46/M40) involves travel through the town, including the need to cross the River Avon, your officers understand that the promoters have received some enquiries from firms considering relocation. However, the STA work confirms that an allocation of around 10ha, if proposed in addition to a development of 3,500 homes at Long Marston Airfield (LMA), would be problematic because of the cumulative impact of additional vehicle movements on the constrained capacity of the highway network south of the town.

- 2.15 It was accepted at the examination that any relocations required to support the likely extent of redevelopment at the Canal Quarter during the plan period can be largely catered for by the land allocated within Proposal SUA.2 at Wildmoor. Further, if members are minded to endorse the proposal for development at LMA, this will provide additional employment land that could be considered by those wishing to relocate from the Canal Quarter. [Note: employment-related development at LMA is not expected to come forward to any appreciable scale in advance of the completion of a south/western relief route around Stratford, improving the connectivity between the site and the A46.] On balance it is considered unnecessary to promote a further new site as an alternative to SUA.3. It is important to understand that, if the employment/housing balance is to be maintained, any significant net increase to the 35ha of allocated employment land would have to be interpreted as producing a further upward pressure on the housing requirement.

#### **Related matters**

##### 2.16 Development Strategy

- 2.16.1 Policy CS.15 of the submitted strategy deals with the proposed distribution of development (the 'spatial strategy') and will be considered further when the examination resumes. On 22 June the Council endorsed two specific modifications to the policy, making it more positive about development on suitable brownfield sites and referencing a settlement pattern rather than a settlement hierarchy. The proposals above would largely follow the established strategy. The one key addition to the policy would be the addition of Long Marston Airfield as the location for a second new settlement.
- 2.16.2 Policy CS.16 has been substantially modified to reflect the new conclusions about the housing requirement, to specify the revised distribution of development across the district and to identify additional strategic allocations. A new housing trajectory table has been prepared based on the delivery of 566dpa over the period 2011-2016 and 777dpa over the period 2016-2031. This equates to an average of 724dpa over the overall plan period, but recognises that upon adoption of the plan the delivery will need to be increased (from 2016/17) onwards to reflect the lower figures that have formed the basis for our work in the early part of the plan period. As previously indicated, the Local Service Village elements of the policy remain as recently endorsed by Council.

- 2.16.3 A number of updates to the Affordable Housing policy (CS.17) reflecting decisions made nationally about qualifying sites were endorsed in June. As was noted in that report, the evidence before the Inspector was insufficient to persuade him that there is a justification to seek affordable housing as part of Use Class C2 and C2a schemes (those involving an element of care). However, the modified wording of the policy as presented in June did not completely reflect that promoted by the Inspector. That omission is corrected here.
- 2.17 Area Strategies
- 2.17.1 The Stratford-upon-Avon Area Strategy is proposed to be modified to reflect the identification of land off Bishopton Lane as a strategic housing site (new Proposal SUA.4), the inclusion of an element of housing as part of the mainly employment-led allocation south of Alcester Road (updated Proposal SUA.2) and the need to provide a south western relief road in association with the proposed allocation of Long Marston Airfield as a strategic site. The provision of this road will be reflected in the revised Infrastructure Delivery Plan and its proposed alignment will then be safeguarded under Policy CS25(D).
- 2.17.2 The Southam Area Strategy is proposed to be modified to reflect the identification of land south of Daventry Road as a strategic housing site (new Proposal SOU.3).
- 2.17.3 Proposal GLH (Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath New Settlement) is retained as a strategic housing and employment allocation. The only updates to this proposal reflect the revised delivery trajectory outlined under Policy CS.16, with a total of 2,300 homes now expected to be built by 2031. This reflects the view that delivery in the early years must be re-profiled to recognise the later than expected adoption of the Core Strategy and the associated SPD. As endorsed in June, the proposals include the identification of land to accommodate an expansion at AML.
- 2.17.4 New Proposal LMA (Long Marston Airfield New Settlement) is presented to reflect the inclusion of this strategic site. The proposal confirms the expected delivery of a substantial amount of supporting infrastructure including a new village centre, primary and secondary schools, and transport related works including a relief road around the south-western side of Stratford-upon-Avon and public transport improvements.
- 2.17.5 In each instance the expected rate of housing delivery shown in the individual site proposals will be updated to match that shown in the revised Housing Trajectory table within Policy CS.16.
- 2.18 Infrastructure – the Infrastructure Delivery Plan will be updated to reflect additional expectations largely related to the development of the additional strategic sites. This remains work in progress and the IDP will be finalised prior to re-submission to the Inspector to reflect any new information from infrastructure providers becoming available via the forthcoming consultation process.
- 2.19 Consequential modifications – as a result of the main modifications proposed, the Strategy will need to be subject to consequential modifications that reflect the decisions made by The Cabinet and Council. For example, assuming the inclusion of different strategic site options, the text in the Introduction will require updating; references throughout

the document, including in the Vision and Objectives, will have to reflect the new housing requirement.

### **3 Process issues**

- 3.1 This report details the modifications to the submitted Core Strategy that are considered necessary to meet the concerns expressed in the Inspector's Interim Conclusions. Whilst they will add to those previously made as a result of the examination process to date, as endorsed by the Council on 22 June, the forthcoming representations period will be a focused exercise that considers only the revised proposals agreed as a result of this report. It therefore encompasses Policies CS.15, CS.16, CS.17 and the relevant Area Strategies (Stratford-upon-Avon, Southam, Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath and Long Marston Airfield), all as set out in Appendix 3. Looking forward, all modifications considered by the Inspector to be necessary to improve the soundness of the plan will be formally proposed via his Final Report, which will be accompanied by a schedule of recommended Main Modifications.
- 3.2 The period of public consultation will take place in August/September. The new proposals, along with all representations received, will then be submitted to the Inspector (target date 23 October 2015) and the examination will resume. All changes to the Submission Plan proposed by the Inspector that constitute 'Main Modifications' will be open to further representations when the Council publishes them. There is a statutory 6 week representations period at that final stage ahead of adoption.

### **4. Options Available to The Cabinet**

- 4.1 As regards **Recommendation 1**, the options are to endorse the reports and accept them into the evidence base, to request that certain aspects of those reports be revisited, with a subsequent report back to The Cabinet, or to reject the reports. If The Cabinet is minded to favour either the second or third of these options, this is likely to mean that the Core Strategy process will be subject to delay whilst revisions are considered and/or new reports are commissioned. Each report is an important component of the evidence base upon which other decisions rest. Proceeding without an up-to-date evidence base would be highly risky because those representing interests that are not reflected in the revised Strategy would question the soundness of the plan when the examination re-opens. Members are therefore urged to recommend that the reports be endorsed.
- 4.2 In respect of **Recommendation 2**, the further modifications proposed form part of a cohesive package and it is essential that the overall cohesion remains, even in the event that members choose to revise some part of the recommended approach. The options are to endorse the recommendation on the basis of the modifications as set out in the report, to endorse it on the basis of a revised set of modifications as may be agreed by members, or to reject it.
- 4.3 In respect of **Recommendation 3**, the options are simply to agree or not to agree.

## **5. Implications of the Proposal**

### **5.1 *Legal/Human Rights Implications***

5.1.1 Via the examination process the Inspector is obliged to consider whether the Council's Core Strategy is sound and legally correct, i.e. (inter alia) that it is based on up-to-date and reliable evidence. The test of soundness is a statutory test under Section 20(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004. The Cabinet should be satisfied that the proposed modifications reflect the evidence that their impact will be to strengthen the overall Core Strategy, better enabling the Inspector to recommend its adoption.

5.1.2 The provisions of the European Convention on Human Rights should also be taken into account as an integral part of the Council's decision making as regards the Core Strategy.

### **5.2 *Financial***

5.2.1 There are no direct financial implications arising from this report. Financial implications may arise should members consider it necessary to revisit aspects of the evidence base reports.

### **5.3 *Environmental***

5.3.1 The preparation of this spatial strategy for the District has taken full account of potential environmental impacts, and continues to do so. The Core Strategy policies are subject to independent Sustainability Appraisal in accordance with the legal requirements governing the preparation of the Strategy.

### **5.4 *Corporate Strategy***

5.4.1 The Strategy is relevant to the three key objectives set out in the Corporate Strategy 2015-2019. It includes specific proposals to help business and enterprise to flourish, to address housing issues, to secure necessary infrastructure and, to a lesser degree, to improve access to services.

### **5.5 *Analysis of the effects on Equality***

5.5.1 An equality impact assessment was carried out on the submission Core Strategy. This is being refreshed to take into account any substantive modifications that have been endorsed to date and/or are being proposed via this report. The refreshed EqIA will be published as soon as possible, but in any event in advance of the formal consultation period.

## **6. *Risk Assessment***

6.1 The risks of not agreeing the first recommendation are that the Council may not have sufficient evidence to justify the modifications that are being proposed to the plan. This would most likely lead to further complications when the examination process resumes. If additional work needs to be carried out at this stage, the subsequent stages of the plan preparation and adoption process are likely to be delayed. The risks around moving swiftly towards adoption are at their lowest if the evidence base reports are endorsed and the subsequent modifications can be seen as wholly reflective of the overall evidence base.

- 6.2 The risks associated with the second recommendation relate principally to the reputation of the Council. It is understood that the level of development proposed via the modifications is significantly higher than that which had been anticipated during the plan preparation process, and that those communities most directly affected by the new proposals may have concerns. However, the greater risk to the reputation of the Council would appear to lie in not responding positively to the clear steer provided by the Inspector. The possible result would be that the proposals might again be deemed unsound and the Council would thus be unable to adopt its Core Strategy.
- 6.3 The risks of not adopting the third recommendation would be either that there is a delay in publishing the revised document or that the document is published without certain inconsistencies having been corrected.

## **7. Conclusion**

- 7.1 The examination of the Core Strategy to date has provided the Council with considerable clarity about the issues that are largely resolved and, for those that remain outstanding, about the work that is required to address concerns identified by the Inspector. This report and the associated documents provide a clear way forward, identifying both the scale of housing development that is required to support the creation of new jobs locally and the preferred options for accommodating that scale of development.
- 7.2 Subject to a positive resolution from the Council, the next steps are to consult on these new proposals and then to submit them, having regard to any representations made, so that the examination of the Core Strategy can proceed.

Paul Lankester  
CHIEF EXECUTIVE

### Background papers:

- National Planning Policy Framework (CLG, March 2012)
- Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy Inspector's Interim Conclusions (Inspector's letter and report, 18 March 2015)
- Briefing Note 'Summary of the Independent Inspector's Interim Conclusions' (SDC May 2015)
- Review of Objectively Assessed Housing Need in Stratford-on-Avon District (Environmental Resources Management, July 2015)
- Stratford-on-Avon Strategic Transport Assessment: Further Focused Assessment of Development Options in the Stratford-upon-Avon and Southam Areas (Vectos for Warwickshire County Council, July 2015)
- Sustainability Appraisal of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy: Post Inspector's Interim Conclusions Interim SA Report (Lepus Consulting July 2015)

**200. Stratford-on-Avon District Core Strategy – response to Inspector’s Interim Conclusions**

*Councillor Seccombe, having disclosed a Personal Interest in this item, withdrew from the meeting whilst the subject matter was discussed.*

*Council  
20 July 2015*

On the motion of the Chairman of the Council, it was

**RESOLVED:**

That Council Procedure Rule 16.5 (When a Councillor may speak again) be waived to allow one nominated member from each Group to speak more than once and for up to 10 minutes.

Consideration was given to the following recommendations from The Cabinet, who had met on the morning of the meeting to discuss the subject matter:

- (1) That the 'Review of the Objectively Assessed Housing Need' (ERM), the 'Meeting the Housing Requirement: Options Analysis' report (SDC), the 'Stratford-on-Avon Strategic Transport Assessment: Further Focused Assessment of Development Options' (Vectos for WCC) and the 'Sustainability Appraisal of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy: Post Inspector's Interim Conclusions Interim SA Report' (Lepus Consulting) be received as evidence to support the Core Strategy examination process;
- (2) That the Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (OAN) be 14,480 for the period 2011-2031 (724 per annum);
- (3) That the requirement for 'headroom' in the supply figure in the region of 5-7% in addition to the OAN be noted;
- (4) The Policy CS. 16 B include the following strategic sites:-
  - a. 2,300 homes within the plan period from a total of approximately 3,000 homes at Gaydon/ Lighthorne Heath New Settlement (GLH);
  - b. 2,100 within the plan period from a total of approximately 3,500 homes at Long Marston Airfield New Settlement (LMA);
  - c. 450 homes west of Bishopton Lane, Stratford upon Avon (SUA.4);
  - d. 65 homes south of Alcester Road, Stratford upon Avon (SUA.2);
  - e. 500 homes south of Daventry Road, Southam (SOU.3);
- (5) That subject to the approval of recommendation 4 above, the further modifications to the submitted Core Strategy as identified in the attached document be endorsed for formal consideration by the Examination Inspector subsequent to them being published to allow further representations from all interested parties;
- (6) That the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to endorse the consolidated Sustainability Appraisal report for publication ahead of the representations period, subject to the document subsequently being referred to The Cabinet for formal adoption into the Council's evidence base; and,
- (7) That the finalisation of any consequential modifications to the text of the Core Strategy required to ensure consistency with the further modifications endorsed by way of recommendation 5 be

delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council.

Following general discussion the recommendations were individually put to the vote and dealt with as follows:

1. Recommendation 1 was put to the vote and declared carried with 2 Councillors abstaining;
2. Recommendation 2 was put to the vote and declared carried with 1 Councillor voting against;
3. Recommendation 3 was put to the vote and declared carried with 2 Councillors voting against and 1 Councillor abstaining;
4. The various strategic housing sites contained in Recommendation 4 were put to the vote and dealt with as follows:
  - a. Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath – this proposal was declared carried with 6 Councillors voting against
  - b. Long Marston – this proposal was declared carried with 3 Councillors abstaining from voting
  - c. Bishopton Lane, Stratford-upon-Avon – at the request of Councillors Moore and Rolfe in accordance with Council Procedure Rules a recorded vote was taken resulting as follows:

For the proposal 19 votes  
(namely the Chairman, Councillors Barnes, Brain, Cargill, Giles, Gray, Jefferson, Kendall, Kettle, Lawton, Moon, Organ, Parry, Payne, Richards, Riches, Saint, Thirlwell and Williams)

Against the proposal 8  
(namely Councillors Bromwich, Crump, Fojtik, Fradgley, Harris, Mills, Moore, Rolfe)

Abstention 1  
(namely Councillor Howse)

The proposal was declared carried.

- d. Alcester Road, Stratford-upon-Avon – this proposal was declared carried with 4 Councillors voting against and 1 Councillor abstaining
- e. Daventry Road, Southam – at the request of Councillors Crump and Harris in accordance with Council Procedure Rules a recorded vote was taken resulting as follows:

For the proposal 18 votes  
(namely the Chairman, Councillors Brain, Cargill, Fojtik, Giles, Gray, Howse, Jefferson, Kendall, Lawton, Moon, Organ, Parry, Payne, Richards, Saint, Thirlwell and Williams)

Against the proposal 9 votes  
(namely Councillors Bromwich, Crump, Fradgley, Harris, Kettle, Mills, Moore, Riches and Rolfe)

Abstention  
(namely Councillor Barnes)

1

The proposal was declared carried.

With the agreement of the Chairman, the following amendment was proposed by Councillor Barnes and seconded by Councillor Moore:

*Whilst acknowledging the proposed allocation at Long Marston Airfield, the Council recognises the concerns that exist about committing any further development in the area generally to the south of the River Avon in advance of the completion of a relief road that provides a new river crossing. Unless there is clear evidence to the contrary, it will resist development proposals that would generate additional pressure on Clopton Bridge and Welford Bridge and thereby add to traffic congestion in Stratford-upon-Avon.*

On being put to the vote, the amendment was declared lost with 4 Councillors voting in favour and more against with 4 abstentions.

5. Recommendation 5 was put to the vote and declared carried;
6. Recommendation 6 was put to the vote and declared carried with 1 Councillor voting against.
7. Recommendation 7 was put to the vote and declared carried with 1 Councillor voting against.

Thereafter, it was

**RESOLVED:**

(1) That the

- 'Review of the Objectively Assessed Housing Need' (ERM);
- the 'Meeting the Housing Requirement: Options Analysis' report (SDC);
- the 'Stratford-on-Avon Strategic Transport Assessment: Further Focused Assessment of Development Options' (Vectos for WCC); and
- the 'Sustainability Appraisal of the Stratford-on-Avon Core Strategy: Post Inspector's Interim Conclusions Interim SA Report' (Lepus Consulting),

be received as evidence to support the Core Strategy examination process;

- (2) That the Objectively Assessed Need for Housing (OAN) be 14,480 for the period 2011-2031 (724 per annum);
- (3) That the requirement for 'headroom' in the supply figure in the region of 5-7% in addition to the OAN be noted;
- (4) The Policy CS. 16 B include the following strategic sites:-

- a. 2,300 homes within the plan period from a total of approximately 3,000 homes at Gaydon/ Lighthorne Heath New Settlement (GLH)
  - b. 2,100 within the plan period from a total of approximately 3,500 homes at Long Marston Airfield New Settlement (LMA);
  - c. 450 homes west of Bishopton Lane, Stratford upon Avon (SUA.4);
  - d. 65 homes south of Alcester Road, Stratford upon Avon (SUA.2);
  - e. 500 homes south of Daventry Road, Southam (SOU.3);
- (5) That following the approval of (4) above, the further modifications to the submitted Core Strategy as identified in the attached document be endorsed for formal consideration by the Examination Inspector subsequent to them being published to allow further representations from all interested parties;
- (6) That the Chief Executive, in consultation with the Leader of the Council, be authorised to endorse the consolidated Sustainability Appraisal report for publication ahead of the representations period, subject to the document subsequently being referred to The Cabinet for formal adoption into the Council's evidence base; and,
- (7) That the finalisation of any consequential modifications to the text of the Core Strategy required to ensure consistency with the further modifications endorsed under (5) above be delegated to the Chief Executive in consultation with the Leader of the Council.