



Appeal Decision

Hearing Held on 31 October 2023 and 1 November 2023

Site visit made on 1 November 2023

by Jonathan Edwards BSc(Hons) DipTP MRTPI

an Inspector appointed by the Secretary of State

Decision date: 28 November 2023

Appeal Ref: APP/W3710/W/23/3323587

Land At Woodlands Lane, Bedworth CV12 0NN

- The appeal is made under section 78 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (the Act) against a refusal to grant planning permission.
 - The appeal is made by Mr A R Cartwright (Cartwright Homes) against the decision of Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council.
 - The application Ref 038664, dated 3 March 2022, was refused by notice dated 21 April 2023.
 - The development proposed is the erection of 29 dwellings, provision of ancillary open space and the formation of a new access from Woodlands Lane.
-

Decision

1. The appeal is dismissed.

Preliminary Matters

2. The appeal site address above is taken from the appeal form and the Council's decision notice with the post code added for completeness. It is more meaningful than the grid references provided on the application form. The description of development on the appeal form and the Council's decision notice is different to that on the application form. Even so, the original description as set out in the header above forms the basis for my assessment.
3. Paragraph 6.2 of the Council's appeal statement includes a list of documents and revised plans that have been submitted with the appeal. These show minor amendments that do not fundamentally change the proposal. No injustice would be caused by me considering the plans listed at paragraph 6.2.
4. In the interests of clarity, I confirm my assessment is based on the proposed drainage layout as shown on drawing numbered 102 rev P3. This shows a swale and rain garden along the roadside boundary of the site as well as an underground cellular attenuation tank close to the northern boundary. The landscape strategy plan numbered 7558/ASP3/LSP revision B (the landscape plan) is inconsistent with the drainage layout drawing as it indicates an attenuation basin rather than underground water storage. I have ignored the annotation included on the landscape plan in these regards.
5. Prior to the hearing the appellant provided a copy of a unilateral undertaking made pursuant to section 106 of the Act and dated 11 October 2023. At the hearing, the Council's representatives raised concerns over the contents and provisions of the undertaking. On the request of the main parties, I allowed time after the close of the hearing for the appellant to submit a new

undertaking and for the Council to submit further evidence on the requested planning obligations.

6. Subsequently, I received a unilateral undertaking dated 17 November 2023 (the UU). The terms of the UU come into effect if I allow the appeal and grant planning permission. The planning obligations set out in the UU require:-
- the provision of affordable housing as part of the development or payment of a contribution if transfer of the proposed affordable housing to a registered provider cannot be completed;
 - financial contributions towards the improvement of local leisure facilities, parks, allotments and a library. Also, contributions towards maintenance of public rights of way, towards the promotion of sustainable travel and road safety initiatives as well as a monitoring and administration fee;
 - the submission of an updated biodiversity impact assessment that shows a biodiversity net gain would be achieved; and
 - the provision and maintenance of on-site landscaping, pond and drainage system.
7. I have considered the UU, the Council's comments on the planning obligations and the appellant's response in my assessment of the appeal.

Main Issues

8. The main issues are:-
- whether the development would be in a suitable location having regard to the policies of the Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Plan adopted June 2019 (the BP), the National Planning Policy Framework (the Framework) and accessibility;
 - whether it would be acceptable having regard to flood risk and surface water drainage;
 - the effect on the character and appearance of the area;
 - the effect on biodiversity, great crested newts (GCNs) and bats;
 - whether the development would include a suitable mix of market housing; and
 - whether it would ensure acceptable living conditions for the occupiers of the proposed dwelling on plot 14.

Reasons

Suitability of location

9. BP policy DS3 states that new unallocated development outside settlement boundaries as shown on the proposals map will be limited to specified uses. The appeal site lies outside any defined boundaries and it is not allocated for development in the BP. It has not been shown that the proposal needs to be located outside of settlement boundaries and so it would not accord with BP policy DS3.

10. Policy TC3 of the BP states that new residential development should be within 1200m walking distance of a district or local centre. The nearest identified centre to the appeal site is at Smorrall Lane. This consists of a parade of shops including convenience stores, a pharmacy, hot food takeaway outlets, a hairdressers and other commercial units. The Council's refusal reason states the local centre is 1600m walking distance from the site, although slightly longer distances were advanced by both main parties at the hearing. In any event, it is evident the nearest local centre would be beyond the stipulated walking distance from the proposed houses. As such, the development would not accord with part 1 of BP policy TC3.
11. The lit roadside pavements between the appeal site and Smorrall Lane provide a safe environment for pedestrians. Also, the National Travel Survey 2021 shows an upward trend in the frequency and length of walking trips. Even so, the significant separation distance would not promote walking to the Smorrall Lane facilities and the return trip back to the proposed residences. The delivery services provided by the chemists and takeaway businesses would still require travel between Smorrall Lane and the site. Such trips are likely to be by motorised vehicle.
12. The BP allocates land off Woodlands Road for a large residential development to include a local centre, primary school and access to bus services. However, there is no convincing evidence to indicate when any facilities would be delivered. Indeed, at the hearing the Council raised doubts over whether any local centre would be provided at all. With the uncertainty on these matters, little weight is attached to the contention that a local centre would be developed in the future within 1200m of the appeal site.
13. There is a convenience store and doctors' surgery on Woodlands Road. The appellant says these are about 1000m from the site and so within the 1200m distance stipulated within BP policy TC3. There is also a hair salon on Newtown Road that is noted as being just beyond 1200m from the appeal site but closer than Smorrall Lane. In light of BP policy TC3, it is fair to consider these facilities as being within an acceptable walking distance from the appeal site. Even so, it is likely they would only meet a small part of the day-to-day needs of future residents, particularly when compared to the broader range of facilities at Smorrall Lane. As such, the proximity of these services to the site does not fully address the identified conflict with part 1 of BP policy TC3.
14. The appellant refers to the Department for Education's statutory guidance for local authorities on travel to school June 2023. This sets out statutory walking distances to determine whether a child is eligible for free travel to school. However, there is no indication within the document that such distances form a sound basis to assess whether residential development would provide appropriate accessibility to schools. In this case, the nearest primary schools would be significant walking distances away from the site with the closest secondary school even further away. The development would not be so near to schools so as to promote walking trips.
15. The nearest bus stops on Newtown Road provide access to frequent services between Coventry, Bedworth and Nuneaton. It is agreed that the bus stops would lie about 1200m away from the development and so BP policy TC3 suggests they are within a realistic walking distance for users and visitors of the proposal. However, the Chartered Institution of Highways and

Transportation document 'Planning for Walking' says for bus stops in residential areas, 400m has traditionally been regarded as a cut-off point. Also, the appellant's own building for life 12 checklist recognises the scheme would not have good access to public transport. As such, the development would not be so near to bus services so as to provide an attractive option for most trips to and from the site.

16. The development would be close enough to Bedworth and services within the town to enable accessibility by cycle. However, this would not be an attractive option during inclement weather and cycling would be an unrealistic travel mode for some people. In any event, part 1 of BP policy TC3 refers specifically to walking distance requirements and not cycling distances.
17. Part 2 of BP policy TC3 requires new residential development to be within 8 minutes' drive time to a district centre. Bedworth Town Centre contains a sufficient range of services and would be within a reasonable driving distance from the development. The proposal would accord with Part 2 of BP policy TC3 in these regards.
18. The Council also raise concern the houses would be more than 400m from local park facilities and 600m from a community park. Such distances are stipulated within the Council's Open Space and Green Infrastructure Supplementary Planning Document 2021 (OSSPD). However, the OSSPD's introduction suggests it is not intended to provide guidance in the assessment of proposals against BP policies DS3 or TC3. Also, there is a park with play equipment close to the Woodlands Road surgery as well as The Nook nature reserve. These would provide fairly accessible outdoor recreation facilities for residents of the proposal so as to support healthy lifestyles. Accordingly, I find no conflict with paragraph 92 of the Framework.
19. In summary, I conclude the development would not be in a suitable location having regard to BP policy DS3 and part 1 of BP policy TC3. Having regard to accessibility, I find no conflict with paragraph 92 of the Framework and part 2 of BP policy TC3. Acceptability in these respects does not fully address the identified conflict with BP policies.

Flood risk and surface water drainage

20. BP policy NE4 states that new development should be prioritised to areas of lowest flood risk as defined by the Strategic Flood Risk Assessment: Level 2 (SFRA) and Environment Agency Flood Map for Planning. This approach is consistent with paragraph 162 of the Framework and the aim of the sequential test (ST) to steer new development to areas with the lowest risk of flooding.
21. Appendix II of the appellant's flood risk assessment (the FRA) includes a fluvial flood map from the Environment Agency that shows the site in flood zone 1 so at low risk of flooding. However, the EA map at appendix III of the FRA (the appendix III map) indicates parts of the site are at high, medium and low risk of pluvial flooding as opposed to being at very low risk. The map shows the extent of surface water flooding to the front part of the appeal site, on Woodlands Road in front of the site and on the land opposite.
22. Photographic evidence demonstrates the situation in times of flooding. There has been at least one occasion when surface water is of sufficient depth to cause closure of the road from a point just south of the appeal site up past its

- northern boundary. Photographs show that parts of the site itself are subject to pooling during such events.
23. The SFRA has not been provided to me as part of the appeal process. From the verbal evidence given at the hearing I understand the appendix III map, or something similar, is included in the SFRA. As such, it would seem the SFRA defines part of the appeal site as being at risk of surface water flooding. This includes land on which proposed houses would be located.
24. In the statement of common ground, the Council and the appellant agree that there is no need to apply the ST in respect of flood risk. However, it has been subsequently accepted by the parties that the SFRA does indeed identify part of the site as being at risk of surface water flooding. Also, the appendix III map and submitted photographs are compelling evidence that the site is subject to surface water flooding and it is not in an area of lowest flood risk. The Framework states the sequential approach should be used in areas known to be at risk from any form of flooding. As such, the ST should be applied.
25. The appellant's representative at the hearing accepted that a ST has not been carried out. Therefore, the evidence fails to show there are no available and suitable sites for the development in areas with a lower risk of flooding. In these regards, the proposal would be contrary to the provisions of the Framework and BP policy NE4.
26. The development would be protected from flooding through an increase in levels and raising the ground floors of houses on parts of the site. Compensatory flood storage space would be provided through the proposed swale along the front boundary. This would connect to an existing roadside ditch so as to provide extra water storage capacity. Also, the appellant intends to take on the maintenance of the roadside ditch so that its full storage capacity will be available in a flood event.
27. However, I find the appellant's approach to flood water management to be over-simplistic. There is a lack of firm information on how the existing roadside ditch system in the local area operates and whether as a network it is efficient in disposing of surface water. On my visit, the ditch outside the site was almost full of water with no indication as to how this would leave the ditch or what impediments to flow may exist. I was told that there are culverts leading into and from the ditch but it is unclear whether these are suitable to accept additional water storage as a result of the proposed swale. Without such assurance, there is a concern that water collected in the swale would remain for significant periods of time, thereby reducing its capacity to accept additional run-off in a flood event. Also, the evidence does not clearly demonstrate the effects of any additional maintenance to the ditch. As such, I am unconvinced the proposed measures would avoid an increase in flood risk on the site, on the road or on adjoining land.
28. In any event, the Planning Practice Guidance states the ST still needs to be satisfied even when a flood risk assessment shows the development can be made safe without increasing risk elsewhere. The ST has not been met and so the development would not accord with the Framework's provisions on flood risk.
29. The Council is concerned that the proposed surface water drainage is not a truly sustainable system as it includes underground attenuation. In these

regards, the development would go against the preference set out in BP policy NE4 for above ground storage of surface water that can offer enhanced biodiversity and amenity value to a development.

30. The proposal would include the swale and rain garden that are sustainable drainage features. Even so, the appellant's FRA explains that above ground attenuation for surface water would be unsuitable due to insufficient space as part of the development. However, it would seem that adequate space for above ground attenuation could be achieved through a reduction in the number of dwellings proposed. As such, I find there is insufficient evidence to justify a departure from the preference set out in BP policy NE4. The benefits of the proposed drainage system providing more effective control of surface water run-off would not address nor override this conflict with policy.
31. For the above reasons, I conclude the development would be unacceptable having regard to flood risk and surface water drainage. Therefore, it would be contrary to BP policy NE4 and paragraphs 162, 167 and 169 of the Framework.

Character and appearance

32. The site is an open grassed field. By the boundary to the rear is a small stable building and a pond surrounded by trees and bushes. Mature trees along the front of the site overhang Woodlands Road. Residences on Dove Close are next to the southern boundary and an electricity substation is to the north.
33. The site lies in the Bedworth Woodlands Rural Fringe landscape character area as defined in the Council's Land Use Designations Study 2012. Such areas are characterised by small scale pastoral farming with mature hedgerows and trees representing an older rural landscape. The landscape condition is rated as moderate with a recommendation to enhance.
34. Dove Close and the sub-station influence the appearance of the site and the locality. However, the prominence of trees over buildings ensures the road has a significant rural feel. The mostly undeveloped nature of the site contributes to the more natural qualities of the local environment. The plot is not designated for its landscape importance but it forms part of the countryside and therefore has an intrinsic character and beauty.
35. The introduction of 29 houses with associated infrastructure and activities would result in a marked change in the appearance of the site. The replacement of a field by a residential cul de sac would undermine the pastoral character and appearance of the plot and its contribution to the rural sense of the locality.
36. Apart from the removal of vegetation to create the access, the landscape plan indicates that mature trees and vegetation along the roadside boundary would be retained and further enhanced. This is reflected in the appellant's aboricultural impact assessment that shows most of these trees to be retained and protected during construction works. However, while they have regard to the positioning of the proposed houses, the landscape plan and aboricultural assessment do not take account of the proposed swale and rain garden. At the hearing, the appellant's representatives recognised that there is a potential conflict between the construction of the drainage and flood relief measures and the intention to retain most of the roadside trees.

37. This leads to a significant degree of uncertainty whether the development could be constructed without removal of roadside vegetation or without harming the well-being of the trees. Also, there are no detailed planting proposals to show there would be sufficient space for any replacement planting in front of the houses nearest to the road. Consequently, it is unlikely the screening effect provided by the existing roadside vegetation would be maintained. It follows the development would be visible from the road along the whole frontage of the site.
38. The adjacent enclosed fields would prevent views of the houses from a distance. However, from the local properties and the adjacent highway the erosion of openness and the loss of the rural feel to the plot would be noticeable. In these regards the development would fail to recognise the visual qualities of the site and the locality.
39. The proposal would be in a single field so that it would respect the existing field pattern. Also, the planting of trees, hedges and shrubs along the western and northern edges of the site would reinforce the natural field boundaries. In these regards, the proposal would enhance positive features in the landscape and so it would accord with part of BP policy NE5.
40. However, any landscape benefits would only be appreciated in the context of the proposed houses. The encroachment of development onto the field would be the most notable visual effect and would far outweigh any benefits as a result of enhancement to boundary vegetation, particularly given the uncertainty over the effects on the roadside trees. Also, there are no firm details to show that new planting within the scheme would have any meaningful softening effect on the visual impact of the housing.
41. The development would not appear entirely unusual to the locality given the presence of Dove Close and the substation. This would reduce the detrimental effects of the scheme but a degree of harm would still occur to the landscape as recognised at table 5 of the appellant's statement of case.
42. For the above reasons, I conclude the development would be detrimental to the character and appearance of the area. In these regards, it would not accord with the parts of BP policy NE5 that require major development to conserve, enhance and respond positively to landscape setting. Also, the proposal would not recognise the intrinsic beauty and character of the countryside and so it would not accord with paragraph 174 of the Framework.
43. BP policy NE5 requires developers to show they have considered development opportunities in areas of least landscape value prior to development being permitted in higher value landscapes. The hierarchy in the policy has enhance landscape character areas such as that applicable to the appeal site as the third highest value. There is no evidence to show the appellant has considered any development opportunities in areas rated as having a lower landscape value. In these regards, the requirements of BP policy NE5 have not been met.

Biodiversity, GCNs and bats

44. According to the appellant's preliminary ecological appraisal (PEA) the site is species rich, semi-improved grassland with a pond and treeline along the road. The grassland is rated of high ecological value with the hedge and tree lines and pond classed as moderate to high value. It is accepted that the loss of the

grassland will cause a net loss of biodiversity and that substantial off site mitigation would be required to create biodiversity net gain.

45. The appellant has also provided an eDNA and updated Biodiversity Impact Assessment report (BIA). This explains that boundary vegetation will be retained and protected with a new tree line established on the northern boundary. It is suggested that the enhancement measures would lead to a net increase in hedgerow units on the site. However, it would seem that this increase relies on the retention and enhancement of the line of trees along the road. As stated previously, I am uncertain whether this could be achieved given the proximity of the proposed swale to the trees.
46. In any event, the BIA includes a metric that recognises the development would result in a significant loss of on-site habitat units. The BIA says there would be opportunities to achieve biodiversity gain on the land immediately to the west of the site that is shown to be in the control of the appellant. It is stated that existing neutral grassland and 2 ponds in the adjacent field that are of poor condition could be enhanced. The planning obligation in these regards is noted.
47. Under BP policy NE3, biodiversity offsetting is a last resort but is permissible provided offsetting metrics are used to quantify the impact and calculate an appropriate level of compensation. The policy also says that where an ecological assessment identifies an adverse impact it should set out a mitigation strategy to reverse the loss of biodiversity and create a net gain.
48. The current biodiversity value of the site has been calculated and it is clear the development would reduce this value. However, there is no metric information to explain the current biodiversity value of the adjoining field or how this would be affected by biodiversity offsetting measures. The adjacent land provides an opportunity to enhance biodiversity but it has not been shown whether this would be of a level to offset the adverse effects of the development. Without further information on the adjoining field and the effect of proposed enhancement measures there is a significant doubt over whether adequate biodiversity gain can be secured. In such circumstances, the imposition of a planning condition as suggested would be unreasonable. Also, in the absence of any biodiversity metric, it has not been shown how biodiversity net gain would be secured as required under the relevant planning obligation.
49. The BIA also confirms the evidence of GCNs being present in the pond on the appeal site. Further surveys have recorded a single GCN that indicates breeding has taken place in the pond. The appellant concludes the pond supports a very small population of GCNs that would migrate between ponds in the local area. The pond on the site would be retained as part of the proposal. The development would result in the loss of terrestrial habitat suitable for GCNs but it is suggested that this would be compensated for through enhancements to the field to the west.
50. Only 1 of the GCN surveys was carried out before mid-May, contrary to guidelines from English Nature that says there should be at least 2 surveys between mid-April to mid-May. In light of this, the Council's position is that the population estimates should not be relied upon and that it should be assumed that a medium size population of GCNs are present. However, even if this stance is accepted, I am satisfied that enhancement and management of the adjoining field and the ponds it contains would provide sufficient compensatory habitat, particularly as the evidence suggests there is significant scope to

improve the adjacent land to the benefit of GCNs. Such measures could be secured by planning condition. As such, I am satisfied the conservation status of the GCN population would be preserved.

51. The PEA also recommends bat emergence surveys be carried out as the site has high ecological value for bat commuting. However, the PEA and the BIA say the stables and the trees in the field do not offer potential for bat roosts. I am satisfied that the development would not cause harm to bats, even in the absence of emergence surveys.
52. In summary, I find the development would not cause harm to GCNs and bats. This is a neutral factor in my overall assessment. However, insufficient evidence has been provided to show a net gain in biodiversity could be achieved. In these regards, the proposal would be contrary to BP policy NE3.

Housing mix

53. Under BP policy H1, development is required to provide a mix of housing sizes based on the needs and demands identified in the most up-to-date strategic housing market assessment and having regard to the characteristics of the area. The most up to date housing need assessment is the Council's Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment 2022 (HEDNA). The appellant agrees that the mix of market housing as proposed would not accord with that recommended in the HEDNA as it would include an excess of 3 and 4 bedroom dwellings and an undersupply of 1 and 2 bedroom properties.
54. BP policy H1 follows on from guidance at paragraph 62 of the Framework that requires assessment of housing needs from different groups. The justification to BP policy H1 explains that houses of different sizes are needed to redress current imbalances and to meet the needs of changing household structure. Failure to provide a suitable mix as identified in the HEDNA would undermine these legitimate objectives.
55. The appellant suggests the mix of market housing recommended in the HEDNA should only apply to larger schemes which would have a greater effect on the overall housing stock. BP policy H1 makes no such distinction. Also, I see no reason why the scale of the proposed development would prevent the inclusion of more smaller market houses so the mix would align with the provisions of the HEDNA. There is no convincing evidence of local housing demand to support the appellant's claim that the location of the development would make it more attractive to families rather than single or couple households.
56. For these reasons, I conclude the development would not provide a suitable mix of market housing. In these regards, it would be contrary to BP policy H1.

Living conditions at plot 14

57. The Council is concerned the proposed house on plot 14 would not provide a back garden of sufficient quality due to the effects of the proposed garage on the adjoining plot 15. The garage would be close to the boundary and it would protrude above the side boundary fence. Even so, its roof would slope up and away from the common boundary and it would be fairly low. As such, the garage would avoid unacceptable overshadowing or overbearing effects. I am referred to paragraph 11.9 of the Council's Sustainable Design and Construction Supplementary Planning Document 2020. This relates to the

effects of extensions on windows and so it is not relevant to the Council's specific concerns regarding plot 14's garden.

58. Therefore, I conclude that acceptable living conditions would be provided for the occupiers of the house on plot 14. In these regards, the proposal would accord with BP policy BE3. Amongst other things, this looks for development to be designed to a high standard. Acceptability in these regards is a neutral factor in my overall assessment.

Planning obligations

59. The planning obligations suggested by the Council are agreed to by the appellant through the UU. I find the required contributions would be necessary, fair and reasonable. However, these seek to address the additional demands on local services and infrastructure as a result of the proposal and so they would only bring minor benefits to the wider population. The obligations regarding the provision and maintenance of landscaping and drainage are also needed but they would primarily seek to address the effects of the development. These too would only constitute a minor benefit to the scheme.
60. The planning obligation that secures affordable housing or a contribution in lieu of actual provision would help address a significant demand for such units, as acknowledged by the Council at the hearing. This obligation is fair, reasonable and necessary and represents a clear benefit to the proposal.

Other considerations and planning balance.

61. For the reasons as set out under the first 5 main issues, I find the proposal would be contrary to BP policies. The scheme would not accord with the development plan when read as a whole. It follows to consider whether there is justification to allow the appeal contrary to the provisions of the BP.
62. The Framework requires the Council to annually identify a supply of specific deliverable sites sufficient to provide 5 years' worth of housing against housing targets set out in the BP. For the 5 year period from 1 April 2023 to 31 March 2028, the Council claims that 5.47 years of supply can be identified. The appellant says that the Council has over-estimated the delivery of housing on sites allocated for development in the BP. As an alternative they suggest only 4.53 years of housing land supply can be demonstrated, a shortfall of 572 against the agreed 5 year need of 6030 dwellings.
63. If the appellant's position is accepted, footnote 8 of the Framework indicates that paragraph 11(d) of the Framework is relevant in the assessment of this appeal. However, I have found the proposal would not accord with the Framework's provisions in respect of flood risk, particularly in that it has not been shown that the development could be accommodated on land at a lower risk of flooding. In light of footnote 7 of the Framework, the application of the Framework's policies that protect areas of risk of flooding provide a clear reason for refusing the proposal. The circumstances as set out at paragraph 11(d)(i) of the Framework exist and so the presumption in favour of granting planning permission as laid out under paragraph 11 does not apply.
64. Nonetheless, the development would add to the local housing stock. This benefit attracts significant weight if it is accepted there is a shortfall in housing land supply. Moreover, the proposed 7 affordable units are an additional and important benefit in light of the acknowledged shortfall in provision.

65. The development would generate construction employment and investment to the local economy. The introduction of a drainage system onto the site would improve the management of surface water, notwithstanding the identified concerns in respect of flooding and the inclusion of underground rather than above ground attenuation. Also, the improvements to landscaping, local services and infrastructure secured through the UU may benefit the wider public as well as the occupants of the development. Collectively, these benefits attract moderate weight.
66. The appellant claims the retention of landscape features and proposed biodiversity enhancements would be an advantage of the development. However, for the reasons as already set out, I am unable to conclude the proposal would lead to a gain in biodiversity. Therefore, this factor offers limited support to the case for granting planning permission.
67. Overall, the benefits of the development would be significant. However, the harm I have identified for a range of reasons attracts very substantial weight. The adverse effects would significantly outweigh any benefits and so there is insufficient justification to grant planning permission contrary to BP policies.

Conclusion

68. For the above reasons, I conclude the appeal should be dismissed.

Jonathan Edwards

INSPECTOR

APPEARANCES

FOR THE APPELLANT:

Mitchell Barnes	Associate Director at Frampton Town Planning
Nicola Lea	Land Manager at Cartwright Homes
Stuart Dunhill	Director at ADC Infrastructure
Dan Edwards	Director at PRP
Chris Jenkinson	Associate Director at Aspect Landscape

FOR THE LOCAL PLANNING AUTHORITY:

Richard Humphreys KC	
Karina Duncan	Principal Planning Officer
Sarah Matile	Principal Planning Officer
Chris Brammeier	Senior Flood Risk Management Engineer

David Lowe	Team Leader for Ecology, Historic Environment and Landscape, Warwickshire County Council
Chris Lancett	Development Management Highway Engineer, Warwickshire County Council
Maria Bailey	Assistant Director - Planning
Jacqueline Padbury	

INTERESTED PERSONS

Cllr Kyle Evans	Local Councillor
Cllr Martin Walsh	Local Councillor
Karl Mayer	Objector
Louise Parker	Objector
Roger Foster	Objector
Mary Dinine	Objector

LIST OF DOCUMENTS SUBMITTED AT THE HEARING:

1. List of plans, drawings and documents upon which the LPA made their decision.
2. Document from the Council entitled Woodlands Lane, Bedworth – Unilateral Undertaking APP/W3710/W/23/3323587 – The Unilateral Undertaking dated 11 October 2023 is not approved by the Borough Council or the County Council in its current form.
3. Five Year Position Statement Following Publication of NBBC Trajectory 2023, Framptons.
4. Parker L Submission, Appendix A, Photographs of Woodlands Lane flood, Friday 20 October 2023.