



Appeal Decision

Inquiry held on 20 – 22 June 2023

Formal site visit made on 22 June 2023

by S Dean MA MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 2nd August 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/U4610/W/23/3317005

Henley Road, Coventry, CV2 1ED

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 against a refusal to grant outline planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Coventry College against the decision of Coventry City Council.
 - The application Ref OUT/2021/2639, dated 11 August 2021, was refused by notice dated 27 September 2022.
 - The development proposed was described on the application form as “Demolition of existing college buildings and structures and construction of new residential development, including creation of public open space, construction of new vehicular and pedestrian accesses and alterations to existing accesses, highways and drainage infrastructure and soft and hard landscaping (Access Unreserved).”
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The application was made in outline with approval sought for access. Layout, appearance, landscaping and scale would be the subject of future applications for approval of reserved matters. Plans were submitted showing the access locations as well as illustrative parameters and layouts. Although much discussed in evidence, the illustrative plans have been treated as such.
3. A case management conference was held on 11 April 2023 with representatives of the appellant, the Council and Mr Whitlock as the Rule 6 party. At that conference, procedural matters including the main issues and the format of the evidence were discussed and clarified, but the merits of the proposal were not discussed. The Council confirmed that Policy GB1 of the Coventry City Council Local Plan 2017 (the Local Plan) was relevant to their case in respect of their third reason for refusal (my third main issue), despite not being listed on the Decision Notice. The appellant did not object to this.
4. In Part E of the Appeal Form it is stated that the description of development has not changed but, nevertheless, a different wording, matching that used on the Decision Notice has been entered. Neither of the main parties provided written confirmation that a revised description of development had been agreed. However, it was confirmed at the case management conference that the description of development on the Decision Notice (which specified the maximum number of dwellings) was that on which the decision was taken, and appeal submissions made. My decision also therefore proceeds on that basis that the development proposed is “Outline application for the erection of up to 112 residential dwellings with all matters reserved except for access and

associated works including the demolition of the existing college buildings and structures". I am satisfied that no prejudice would occur in me dealing with the appeal in this way.

5. Following their decision on the application and the case management conference, but well in advance of the inquiry and before the deadline for submission of Proofs of Evidence, the Council confirmed that it no longer wished to defend its fourth and fifth reasons for refusal. These reasons related to the effect of the proposal on the character and appearance of the area, which included its compatibility with the adjoining farm, and whether or not the proposal could be sustainably accessed. At that time, they also confirmed in writing their position on Policy GB1 of the Local Plan discussed in the case management conference. Mr Whitlock did not alter his position on the compatibility of the proposal with the adjoining farm.
6. A draft planning obligation under section 106 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 was submitted at the inquiry with a certified copy of the completed obligation being provided after the inquiry closed in accordance with the agreed timescales. The planning obligation includes provisions relating to affordable housing, healthcare contributions, highway contributions, education contribution, off-site sports contribution, and the sports club land. I shall return to this later in my decision.

Main Issues

7. Having regard to the submitted evidence and the Preliminary Matters, the main issues are therefore;
 - whether or not the proposal would provide a suitable housing mix,
 - whether or not the proposal is required to provide affordable housing, and if so, whether or not it would provide sufficient affordable housing,
 - whether or not the loss of green space and sports provision would be justified, and
 - the compatibility of the proposal with the adjoining farm.

Reasons

Housing mix

8. Policy H4 of the Local Plan seeks to secure a mix of market housing which will contribute to meeting the needs of the city, in accordance with the latest Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA). After the application decision the Coventry and Warwickshire Joint Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment, 2022 (the HEDNA) was published. Although not tested at examination, the main parties agreed that this document was the most up-to-date information on housing need in the area, and that it was appropriate to consider its contents in the context of the requirements of Policy H4.
9. It was agreed through cross-examination that the effects of this policy are measured city-wide, rather than site-by-site, and that whilst important for every site, the strategic, that is to say, allocated sites have a larger role to play in delivering the overall aims of the policy.

10. Setting aside the arguments as to whether or not the site and proposal would properly fall within the exception at Part 2b of Policy H4, which allows for a departure from the preferred mix taking into account locational issues, the main parties agree that housing mix on the site could be dealt with through the imposition of a condition requiring its approval as part of any future reserved matters application. Fundamentally, I accept and agree with this position.
11. I note the Council's concerns about such an approach in terms of dealing with future applications. However, I do not consider that the situation they fear would definitely arise. Deferring approval of the final housing mix to a future reserved matters application would not commit the Council to approving a fully SHMA/HEDNA compliant mix for any number of dwellings up to 112 regardless of all other considerations. Although a finely balanced judgement, taking into account the constraints of the site and the density requirements, there is nothing definitive before me which suggests that they would not be able to take into account all of these normal, relevant development management considerations, the requirements of the development plan and all other material considerations. This would of course include Policy H4 and the exceptions within it.
12. As such, were I minded to allow the appeal, then through the imposition of an appropriately worded condition, and the carrying out of the normal development management and decision taking processes, the proposal could, on its face, provide a suitable housing mix for the city and the local area. This would not conflict with the aim of Policy H4 of the Local Plan for residential development to contribute towards a balance of house types and sizes across the city.

Affordable housing

13. Policy H6 of the Local Plan states that new residential schemes of this scale will be expected to provide 25% of all dwellings as affordable homes. The Policy also sets out criteria under which a reduced amount may be acceptable. Separately, the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and the Planning Practice Guidance (the PPG) introduce the concept of Vacant Building Credit (VBC) as an incentive for brownfield development on sites containing vacant buildings.
14. Although the Council's decision did not refer to the application of VBC, the appellant's primary case is that the amount of affordable housing required is none, based on the application of VBC, and that this should be considered in advance of considering the acceptability or otherwise of the amount which may be secured through the grant of planning permission.
15. Local policy before me (but for a reference to a recent SPD) is silent on the application of VBC. However, national policy in paragraph 64 and footnote 30 of the Framework is clear that the re-use of brownfield land "should" be supported by using it to reduce the amount of any affordable housing contribution by a proportionate amount.

16. Turning to the PPG for direction, it was agreed in examination and cross-examination that Paragraph 028¹, which sets out the purpose of the policy and includes an open, indicative list of criteria is the most relevant. Much evidence was led and tested on the first example criteria listed there.
17. However, before setting out those criteria, the PPG is clear that “in considering how the vacant building credit should apply to a particular development, local planning authorities should have regard to the intention of national policy”. This is itself paraphrased in that part of the PPG as being to “incentivise brownfield development, including the... redevelopment of empty and redundant buildings”. The Framework is more succinct; describing how VBC “should” be used to support the “re-use of brownfield land”. This is not an absolute requirement, and the Framework does not have the statutory force of the development plan.
18. I have before me a Financial Viability Appraisal Statement of Common Ground (the FVA SOCG, CD88). This states that “to deliver the levels of profit to a developer to be incentivised to undertake the development... the scheme could deliver... 14.2% of the total units proposed in the submitted scheme” as affordable housing.
19. When the application was reported to Committee, the appellant was willing to accept a planning permission subject to paying a contribution towards affordable housing (albeit 8.9% at that time). I note the appellant suggests that they agreed to certain contributions for expediency. However, given the second criteria listed in the PPG, that it may be appropriate for authorities to consider whether the buildings are covered by an extant or recently expired planning permission for the same or substantially the same development, they cannot have done so with regard to establishing a principle or benchmark around affordable housing with an eye to any future planning application including VBC for the reduction or relief of such contributions.
20. Further, it is clear, both from the appraisal apparently carried out in advance of the consideration of the application by the Council’s Committee, and from the appraisal in the FVA SOCG before me now, that the proposal is viable with an affordable housing contribution. It is also clear that the college has been, and is, motivated by many other factors, such that I do not consider that the re-use of this brownfield land requires the support of VBC as envisaged by the Framework and the Guidance.
21. The PPG sets out that in having regard to the intention of national policy, it may be appropriate to consider whether the building has been made vacant for the sole purposes of re-development.
22. To my mind, it is clear that potential re-development is one of the purposes for which the site was made vacant. However, I do not find that it is the sole purpose. The evidence shows that whatever the history of the college and its aims and intentions throughout various mergers, refurbishments and the attendant publicity, by the time of the application, there were a number of factors, primarily financial but also educational which led to the site becoming vacant. The disposal of the site was plainly sought to address financial factors, and whilst re development is a logical next step (and could potentially result in

¹ Paragraph: 028, Reference ID: 23b-028-20190315, Revision date: 15 03 2019

the greatest financial fillip), it is far from clear that it can reasonably be described as the sole purpose for the site becoming vacant.

23. I do not give much weight to the suggestion that using third party venues for examinations and sports facilities, or that changes to the educational 'offer' show that the sole purpose for the vacation of the site was for re-development at the expense of the quality or quantity of services offered by the college. Given the wider context to the college and its future, it seems that these changes could be a consequence of the site being made vacant, but they could equally be a pragmatic, cost effective way of delivering such services, facilities and courses which are required, or which the college chooses to offer in a clearly difficult and evolving educational context.
24. Consequently, on the basis of the evidence before me, I cannot therefore agree that the site was made vacant for the sole purposes of re-development.
25. I was provided with a number of appeal decisions (CD48) which also dealt with the issue of VBC and the sole purposes test. Whilst I note the approach taken in each, I only have the decision letters not the evidence on which they were based. Whilst consistency in decision making is an important part of the planning process, all decisions are made on the particular merits of the case and the evidence before the decision maker. As such, although my finding on the sole purposes test is consistent with the examples given, they do not bind on my overall judgement on this matter, nor do they affect the discretion which is inherent in the Framework and PPG.
26. Taking all of the above together, given the imperative both in the Local Plan, as evidenced in the SHMA and the HEDNA, and in national policy, to deliver affordable housing, consistent with the discretionary approach to the application of VBC in the Framework and PPG, and consistent with the process set out by the appellant in CD48, I do not consider that VBC should apply in this case.
27. I must also consider the amount of affordable housing offered in this proposal. The FVA SOCG, sets out an agreed, viable position providing 14.2% of the units on the site delivered as affordable housing. That amount, as well as the security of the tenure of the affordable housing units is secured in the planning obligation. On its face, this addresses the reason for refusal of the Council, and I find that position acceptable in light of the evidence.
28. Despite this, at the inquiry, the appellant raised the potential to deal with the final percentage of affordable housing through a condition. This would allow for the final affordable housing amount to be deferred to reserved matters stage, once the final housing mix is known. Given their position on highways contributions, it could in theory allow for an increased amount of affordable housing. However, there is no guarantee of this.
29. I accept that it is potentially more rigorous to fix the amount of affordable housing as close to delivery as possible, to allow the application and consideration of the most up-to-date factors (such as total number of units, their mix, and associated viability matters). However, such a situation, where the amount of affordable housing is fixed at outline stage, is not unusual, and in this case, would give certainty. I find this certainty to be consistent with the aims of the Local Plan and the Framework to plan for and provide affordable

housing to meet needs. If future changes were required, then mechanisms exist to make such changes.

30. Overall, I conclude that the proposal is required to provide affordable housing, and it would, on balance provide a sufficient amount, having regard to the financial viability of the proposal. This complies with Policy H6 of the Local Plan, national policy around delivering a sufficient supply of homes in the Framework and the PPG.

Green space and sports provision

31. Policy GB1 of the Local Plan deals with development proposals in both the Coventry Green Belt and designated Local Green Space (LGS). The southern part of the appeal site, and the rest of the land in the same ownership (the blue-land) fall within designated LGS. The rationale behind the site crossing into the designated LGS is unexplained.
32. During preparation of the Local Plan, the Green Belt boundaries were altered, with some land, including part of this site, being removed from it and designated as LGS. This was done in recognition of its limited contribution to the Green Belt purposes but acknowledging its importance as green infrastructure within the city. Such green infrastructure and space is also valued and protected in Local Plan Policies GE1 and GE2.
33. The designated LGS within the appeal site covers an unused, derelict Multi-Use Games-Area (MUGA), tennis courts and an area of car parking. Whilst not green space as such, these clearly support the value of the wider adjoining designated LGS, and in any event, were present when the Green Belt was reviewed, its boundaries altered, and this site assessed and designated as LGS.
34. Illustrative plans show that these areas would be built upon. Despite the plans being illustrative, it was nevertheless agreed in examination and cross-examination that areas of designated LGS would be lost. Compensatory, publicly accessible green space would be provided elsewhere within the site, with measures in the planning obligation seeking to address the loss of the MUGA and tennis courts.
35. National policy as set out in the Framework is that policies for managing development in designated LGS should be consistent with those for Green Belt, but not that they are the same policies or tests. Accordingly, Policy GB1 (part 2B) of the Local Plan sets out that development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances are demonstrated. Parties agreed in examination and cross-examination that in order for the proposal to be acceptable, very special circumstances would have to be demonstrated.
36. The appellant suggests that the net increase in publicly accessible open space, the community accessibility of the playing fields in the blue-land as a result of land transfer in the planning obligation, and improved connectivity through and across the site, are the considerations which when taken together amount to very special circumstances, such that the policy test is satisfied.
37. The appellant also suggests that the proposed mitigation for the loss of sports facilities on the site weigh in favour of the very special circumstances case set out.

38. Turning directly to that, I accept that the sports facilities to be lost to the proposal, being a derelict MUGA, tennis courts and a changing facility not accessible to the public, are capable of being replaced. Indeed, it appears that the sporting activities of the college have already been relocated, and the amount of public open space illustratively proposed within the site is larger than the MUGA, tennis courts and car park which would be lost.
39. Sport England, as a statutory consultee initially objected to the proposal owing to the loss of tennis courts and sought a significant financial contribution to offset that. Since that time, the position has evolved, and they now appear to be satisfied with the payment of a much smaller amount for the Council to spend at their direction, coupled with the transfer of the sports pitches in the blue-land for community-club use.
40. Whilst I accept that Sport England, as the statutory consultee no longer object to the proposal, subject to those terms, it remains for me, as the decision maker to be satisfied as to whether or not the relevant test in paragraph 99 of the Framework is passed. That paragraph requires that existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location.
41. There is a proposal, which would be secured through the planning obligation to provide the opportunity to transfer the blue-land to a local sports club, provide the opportunity of land for an associated clubhouse, and provide for the payment of an Off-Site Sports Contribution towards new or improved sports facilities in the area.
42. The existing sports facilities would be lost to the proposed development. Both the blue-land transfer and clubhouse are subject to varying degrees of conditionality in the planning obligation, and the layout showing the areas of proposed, compensatory open space is only illustrative. Furthermore, there is no mechanism which gives me certainty as to how the Off-Site Sports Contribution would be used to provide new or improved sports facilities in the area, beyond its definition in the planning obligation.
43. Taken together, these lead me to conclude that I do not, and cannot know that the loss of sports provision would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location. I also cannot know whether the quantity, quality and functionality of proposed green infrastructure and green space would pass the tests in the Local Plan, notably Policy GE1.
44. This uncertainty is added to by the suggestion that although layout is a reserved matter, the issues around housing mix could be resolved through alterations to the illustrative layout, despite that same illustrative layout being relied on to give me comfort on this issue.
45. Unlike VBC, there is no suggestion that the phrase 'very special circumstances' has a special meaning beyond the ordinary meaning of those words. So, taking that ordinary meaning, very special circumstances must be just that; demonstrating them cannot be as simple as meeting policy requirements in the most part (public open space, connectivity, mitigation for lost facilities) and offering an opportunity for community use of existing sports pitches and a new clubhouse. The bar is plainly higher than that.

46. I acknowledge that there are other benefits from the proposal which I take into account in determining whether or not the loss of green space and sports provision would be justified, including the provision of housing, including affordable housing, and support for the college. However, to my mind, and on the evidence before me, none of these are so special, individually or collectively, again, simply being policy requirements, that they require the loss of designated LGS or amount to very special circumstances.
47. In light of that, as well as the general uncertainty upon which the appellant seeks to rely on in terms of the overall nature of the proposal as an outline application, in which nothing but the maximum number of dwellings, as set out in the agreed description of development, affordable housing amount and points of access are fixed, I find that I am able to give relatively limited weight to these factors put to me by the appellant.
48. As a result, I do not consider that very special circumstances exist, and as such, find direct conflict with Policy GB1 of the Local Plan. My conclusion on the unjustified loss of sports provision also weighs against the proposal.
49. I acknowledge that in their report to Committee, Officers were satisfied on these matters, however, my conclusion is on the evidence before me, so I find it an appropriate one to reach.
50. I therefore find that the loss of green space, including designated LGS and sports provision would not be justified, and the proposal would therefore conflict with Policies GB1, CO2, GE1 and GE2 of the Local Plan, which seek, amongst other things, to ensure that designated LGS, green space and green infrastructure is protected and valued. It would also conflict with national policy in the Framework around protecting open space and opportunities for recreation.

The adjoining farm

51. Henley Mill Farm buildings lie to the south of the appeal site, with sheds and barns bordered on two sides by the blue-land shown on the application drawings. Despite some vegetation growth at the boundary with the farm buildings, metal fencing and metal walls of some of these buildings directly abut that blue-land.
52. Grazing land associated with the farm extends along the western boundary of the site, between it and the River Sowe, up to the Henley Road. This land is at a lower level than the appeal site and separated from it by substantial vegetation, trees, some hedging and fencing. There is clear evidence of unauthorised access being taken through this boundary onto the farm.
53. As the proposal is in outline with approval sought only for access at this time, it is impossible to know how the boundary between the site and the grazing land would be dealt with in any future application for approval of reserved matters.
54. However, the illustrative plans did show public open space along the boundary between the site and the farm. Along with the likely future requirement for details of landscaping and boundary treatments, there is nothing before me which suggests that future residents, cows and agricultural machinery, could not be kept apart such that all could be kept safe.

55. I note of course Mr Whitlock's serious concerns over the attractiveness of farmland for the curious of all ages, but do not consider that what is proposed here; residential development alongside actively grazed farmland, is any different to countless other developments across the country. Indeed, given the current boundary vegetation, change in levels and likely future requirements for boundary treatments, I consider that the situation and relationship here could be more secure than elsewhere.
56. In reaching this conclusion, I must make clear however that I am only dealing with the relationship of the appeal site, that is, the red-line area, to the farm.
57. I acknowledge Mr Whitlock's serious and very real concerns around existing trespass and animal welfare issues specifically connected to use of the blue-land for sports, and the potential for an increase of those issues were that use to increase dramatically. However, the appeal proposal does not, in itself propose any development on that blue-land. It only provides through the planning obligation, for the transfer of that land to the approved sports clubs. Their use of the pitches on that land would not, in itself, appear to require planning permission, and indeed, it would appear that there is nothing stopping the most recent college and limited community use of those pitches from resuming, beyond the scope of this planning application.
58. Any future development on that land, including any clubhouse or other facilities, would require planning permission, and in that process, the compatibility of those proposals with the farm, including any appropriate mitigation would, one expects, be considered.
59. Therefore, considering solely the development proposed, I find that it would be compatible with the adjoining farm. As such, it would not conflict with Policy DE1 of the Local Plan, which seeks to ensure that development respects its surroundings, responds to its physical context and preserves, through the compatibility of uses, the character of an area. Similarly, I do not find conflict with national policy in the Framework around achieving well-designed places which are sympathetic to the surrounding built (and in this case, agricultural) environment.

Suggested conditions and planning obligation

60. I have had regard to the agreed, suggested conditions, as well as to the guidance in paragraph 55 of the Framework to consider whether otherwise unacceptable development could be made acceptable through the use of conditions or a planning obligation.
61. Despite the potential ability to deal with the issue of housing mix by condition, I do not consider that the other conditions proposed, or indeed, any such other conditions as I could draft, could appropriately overcome the harm and development plan conflict I have found.
62. The planning obligation before me makes provision for the contributions and actions which parties consider necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms. I am satisfied that it would be legally sound and do what is required of it in terms of securing the amount of affordable housing, retaining it as such, securing healthcare contributions, highway contributions and the education contribution.

63. I note the argument that the highway contributions are not required as they have not been triggered by Policy AC1 of the Local Plan. However, national policy in the Framework is clear that the planning system should actively manage patterns of growth to support the promotion of sustainable transport, including through limiting the need to travel and offering a genuine choice of transport modes. It is also clear that all developments that will generate significant amounts of movement should be required to provide a travel plan, and the application should be supported by a transport statement. As such, I find that the highway contributions would be required. These contributions would therefore directly relate to the development and would be fairly related in scale and kind to the development.
64. As discussed above however, I have significant reservations around the Off-Site Sports Contribution, and the opportunities around the sports club land and uses provided for in the planning obligation. Had I accepted, in my reasoning above, that the opportunities around the sports club land in the planning obligation satisfied the Local Plan requirements, then those provisions in the planning obligation would meet the tests in paragraph 57 of the Framework. The Off-Site Sports Contribution however does not meet that test, as there is no mechanism which gives me certainty as to how it would be used to provide new or improved sports facilities in the area, beyond its definition in the planning obligation. Consequently, I have not been convinced that the contribution would make otherwise unacceptable development, acceptable, and I do not know how that contribution would be directly related to the development.
65. Overall then, even with the wide-ranging 'blue-pencil' clause, I do not consider that the planning obligation is sufficient to (or therefore necessary to) make the development acceptable in planning terms by overcoming the harm and development plan conflict I have found.

Planning balance and conclusion

66. It is clear from the evidence and the Local Plan, that the residential re-development of Henley College is acceptable in principle, and in reaching this decision, I do not depart from that position.
67. Both the loss of the LGS and the unjustified loss of sports provision would represent significant conflict with the development plan. I have found that the proposal could on its face, provide a suitable housing mix, that it would provide sufficient affordable housing and that it would be compatible with the adjoining farm. It also appears that subject to conditions and contributions, including towards travel and education related matters, other matters could be made acceptable. The proposal could also deliver benefits in terms of housing delivery, including affordable housing, the re-development of a brownfield site, local construction expenditure, future residents' expenditure and an improvement to the financial position of the college. Whilst I have concluded that the issue of housing mix could be dealt with by condition, in terms of my overall conclusion, I find this to be a neutral factor.

68. The appellant directs me towards paragraph 11 of the Framework. However, I have found that the proposal conflicts with the development plan, and there is no suggestion that there are either no relevant development plan policies or that those which are most important for determining the application are out-of-date. Furthermore, the application of policies in the Framework provides, through the finding of harm to designated LGS, a clear reason for refusing the development proposed. As a result, the proposal does not benefit from the presumption in favour of sustainable development in the Framework.
69. Overall, I have found significant development plan conflict which is neither outweighed by those elements of the proposal which do not cause conflict, nor by the benefits of the proposal. There is also a clear reason for refusal in the Framework. I do not find that there are material considerations of such weight to indicate that a decision be taken other than in accordance with the development plan, and as such, the appeal should be dismissed.

S Dean

INSPECTOR

Appearances

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mr Hugh Richards KC

Instructed by Peter Wilkinson of Landmark Planning Ltd

He called;

Mr Peter Wilkinson BA (Hons) MA MRTPI, Landmark Planning Ltd

Mr Chris May LLB LARTPI, Partner at Howes Percival LLP (for planning obligation matters)

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Mr John Hunter

Instructed by Rob Parks, Legal Services Coventry City Council

He called;

Ms Eleanor L Gingell MRTPI, of Smith Jenkins Ltd

Mr Neil Benison BSC MICE IEng, Transport Planning Manager, Coventry City Council (for planning obligation matters and conditions)

RULE 6 PARTY:

Mr David Whitlock, of Henley Farm

Documents submitted during the inquiry

1. Appellant's Opening Statement
2. Council's Opening Statement
3. Maps showing distances to local centre
4. CIL Compliance Statement
5. Updated Planning Statement [on] Education Matters (update to CD79)
6. Working version of the draft planning obligation
7. Rule 6 Closing Submissions
8. Council's Closing Submissions
9. R (Cameron) v Manchester City Council [2021] EWHC 336 (Admin)
10. Appellant's Closing Submissions

Documents submitted after the close of the inquiry

1. Signed and certified completed planning obligation

Core Documents

Local Plan and Supplementary Planning Documents

CD1 Coventry Local Plan 2011-2031 Part 1 (2017)
CD2 Coventry Local Plan Proposals Map
CD3 Not used
CD4 Coventry: SPD Coventry Connected (2018)
CD5 Coventry: SPD Air Quality (2019)
CD6 Coventry: SPD Open Space (2022)
CD7 Coventry: SPD New Residential Design Guide (2023)

Submitted Planning Application Documents (OUT/2021/2639)

Plans

CD8 CRVM-BBA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1001_Location Plan-S8-P03
CD9 CRWM-BBA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1002_Existing Site Plan-S8-P03
CD10 CRWM-BBA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1003_Parameters Site Plan-S2-P02
CD11 CRWM-BBA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1004_Planning Parameters Plan-S8-P03
CD12 CRWM-BBA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1005_Proposed Site Plan -S8-P08
CD13 CRWM-BBA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1006_Proposed Site Plan Zoom-S8-P03
CD14 CRWM-BBA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1007_Waste Audit Management Strategy-S8-P03

Supporting Documents

CD15 Application Form Redacted
CD16 CVHC-BBA-XX-XX-RP-A-0000 Design & Access Statement-S2-P03-compressed
CD17 Coventry Sustainable Building Statement v1
CD18 26365-01-FRA-01 Flood Risk Assessment
CD19 9975 WCS_BIA_v.19.1 09 08 21 Biodiversity Impact Assessment Vol 1
CD20 9975 WCS_BIA_v.19.1 09 08 21 Biodiversity Impact Assessment Vol 2
CD21 Green Space Assessment
CD22 Statement of Community Involvement
CD23 SCI Appendix A Coventry College PC boards
CD24 SCI Appendix B A1 CVone Display Boards v002 DIGITAL 2
CD25 26365-07-UR-01 - Utilities Report Part 1
CD26 26365-07-UR-01 - Utilities Report Part 2
CD27 26365-07-UR-01 - Utilities Report Part 3
CD28 26365-07-UR-01 - Utilities Report Part 4
CD29 26365-07-UR-01 - Utilities Report Part 5
CD30 26365-07-UR-01 - Utilities Report Part 6
CD31 26365-07-UR-01 - Utilities Report Part 7
CD32 26365-07-UR-01 - Utilities Report Part 8
CD33 26365-08-TS-01 – Transport Statement
CD34 26365-08-TP-01 – Travel Plan
CD35 Health Impact Assessment
CD36 252525-01 (01) Coventry College - Phase 1 Desk Study Pt.1
CD37 252525-01 (01) Coventry College - Phase 1 Desk Study Pt.1a
CD38 252525-01 (01) Coventry College - Phase 1 Desk Study Pt.2 LQ
CD39 Asbestos Management Plan
CD40 9975 Arboricultural Assessment
CD41 9975-Badger Survey and Mitigation Strategy Report
CD42 9975-Eco App-Henley College
CD43 Archaeology DBA Coventry Henley Road v2.0
CD44 C10569 Air Quality Assessment

CD45 Topo Survey
CD46 9975-Ecology Constraints and Opportunities Report
Material Submitted after Planning Application Submitted
CD47 RWM-BBA-ZZ-XX-DR-A-1006_Proposed Site Plan Zoom-S8-P04
CD48 Barristers Opinion re VBC
CD49 Eight appeal decisions referred to in Legal opinion
CD50 Coventry College Viability Appraisal
CD51 Viability Assumptions
CD52 PW letter to R Edgington (CCC)
CD53 PW letter 2 to R. Edgington (CCC)
CD54 PW letter 3 to R. Edgington (CCC)
CD55 PW letter 4 to R. Edgington (CCC)
CD56 Coventry College Sports Strategy
CD57 Coventry College Sporting Excellence Prospectus
CD58 Henley College Sports Proposal
CD59 Letter of Coventry College Chair of Governors to Chief Executive (CCC)
CD60 Add Transport Statement 26365-08-TS-01 Rev A

Planning Committee Report & Decision Notice

CD61 Report to Planning Committee 15.9.22
CD61A Late Reps to Committee 15.9.22
CD62 Decision Notice

Statutory Consultation Responses to Planning application OUT/2021/2639

CD63 Highways England
CD64 NHS CCG
CD65 West Mids Police
CD66 Canals & River Trust
CD67 Natural England
CD68 Sport England 27.8.21
CD69 Sport England 13.9.21
CD70 Sport England 15.8.22
CD71 Sport England 07.9.22
CD72 Sport England 15.9.22
CD73 NHS Cov & Warks NHS Trust

Internal to Coventry City Council consultees

CD74 Economic Development 6.9.21
CD75 Highways Development Management 12.10.21
CD76 Highways Development Management 09.5.22
CD77 Archaeology
CD78 Ecology
CD79 Education
CD80 Environment Protection
CD81 LLFA
CD82 Planning Policy
CD83 Streetscene & Greenspace
CD84 Sustainability (Energy)
CD85 Urban Design

Neighbour Objections

CD86 Neighbour objections

Statements of Common Ground

CD87 Statement of Common Ground 13.4.23

CD88 Viability Statement of Common Ground 5.5.23

Statements of Case

CD89 Appellant Statement of Case

CD90 Statement of Case - Coventry City Council

CD91 Statement of Case - David Whitlock

CD92 Agreed Conditions not concluded