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1. Introduction

1.1 This statement has been prepared by Turley Associates on behalf of the University of Warwick in support of an outline planning application for the expansion of the University Campus on the south-west fringes of Coventry (see Location Plan in Appendix 1).

1.2 The University was established in 1964 on approximately 400 acres (162ha) of land straddling the boundary between Coventry and Warwickshire and gifted to the University by the two authorities. A significant part of the overall site was then and still remains in the Green Belt.

1.3 Prior to 1995, this was not a constraint, as universities were regarded as appropriate development in Green Belt, but this changed with revised PPG2. The review of local policy however has not reflected this, and the continued expansion of the University of Warwick is at risk if this application is not successful.

1.4 The so-called Coventry land, which is almost entirely non-Green Belt, is nearing an optimum level of development whereas the more limited and largely residential extent of building on the Warwickshire land, which is all in Green Belt, presents the lion’s share of major development opportunities. It is therefore critical to the future growth of the University that this land is capable of further development in accordance with the original intent of the 1964 charter and the earliest development plans.

1.5 It is important to stress that the development proposed in this application is not a physical expansion of the University beyond its historic boundaries but a combination of infill and extension into areas of the campus with previously constructed roads and infrastructure. It is not a new campus and does not extend into non-University owned land.

The Application

1.6 The outline planning application is for:

*Development for university purposes including construction of buildings for academic teaching; research; social and administrative uses; sports and cultural facilities; residential accommodation for staff, students and visitors; other ancillary facilities including for the purposes of energy generation; access improvements for pedestrians, cyclists and vehicular traffic including public transport services; car parking; site infrastructure including drainage and main services; hard and soft landscaping including structural planting.*
1.7 The application seeks approval for the development of 171,000 square metres (GEA) over the next 10 years (assumed from 2008 to 2018). This is split between the following uses:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>sq.m. GEA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic (teaching and research)</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support**</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Accommodation</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* includes Arts Centre, Management Training, Retail, Students Union, new initiatives
** includes administration, library, social, catering and sports

1.8 The application site boundary extends around the four parts of main campus: Central Campus East and West (either side of Gibbet Hill Road) and the separate but connected Gibbet Hill Campus (to the eastern end of the eponymous road) and Westwood Campus (to the north of Kirby Corner Road).

1.9 The application site surrounds but does not include the University of Warwick Science Park (with the exception of Millburn House which the University recently acquired), nor does it include University-owned agricultural land south of the playing fields. The total application site area is 189.06ha and this includes the existing built estate of the University which amounts to approximately 427,000 square metres (281,775 square metres NIA).

1.10 The application is in outline and comprises the following:

- The application forms and certificate of ownership

**Plans**

- Application site boundary plan
- Parameters Plan (for the purposes of EIA)
- Indicative Masterplan (for illustrative purposes only)
- Landscape Strategy Plan
- Movement Plan

**Supporting Documents**

- Justification for Expansion – author: University of Warwick
- Main Campus Masterplan – author: McCormac Jamieson Prichard (this document also meets the requirement for a Design & Access Statement)
- Planning Statement – author: Turley Associates
- Transport Assessment and Travel Plan – author: Arup
• Environmental Statement (Volumes I-IV) – co-ordinated by Arup with inputs from Arup, Turley Associates, Churchman Landscape Architects, The Environment Partnership and SQW
• Flood Risk Assessment – author: Arup
• Statement of Community Engagement – author: University of Warwick and Turley Associates

1.11 Copies of the submitted plans are to be found in Appendix 2.

1.12 The application is submitted as one but to the two local planning authorities in whose areas the site is situated – the City of Coventry and Warwick District. It has been the subject of an extensive period of pre-application dialogue since 2004 with representatives from the local authorities, including Warwickshire County Council, and advice has been sought from Government Office for the West Midlands (GOWM), the Regional Assembly (WMRA) and Advantage West Midlands (AWM), all of who have participated in a Campus Development Steering Group since 2005. Other stakeholders such as the Highways Agency, the Environment Agency and members of the local academic, residential and business communities have been consulted on several occasions since 2005. This is explained in more detail in the Statement of Community Engagement.

1.13 This planning statement sets out the overall case for the application proposals, as follows:

• Section 2 explains the University’s need to expand – drawing from the “Justification for Expansion” document prepared by the University
• Section 3 provides a description of the site and the application proposals – drawing from the Main Campus Masterplan document
• Section 4 outlines the planning policy considerations against which the proposals must be judged
• Section 5 addresses the principal planning consideration – the justification for allowing development in the Green Belt
• Section 6 addresses the other determining factors, such as transport and environmental considerations – drawing from the Transport Assessment and Environmental Statement
• Section 7 sets out a summary and conclusions.
2. The Need to Expand

2.1 The University of Warwick has become one of Britain's leading universities in the 40 years since it was founded, and is top-rated for the high quality of its teaching and research as well as for its campus. It has also forged strong links with business, the region and with local communities.

2.2 As part of the process of reviewing its 1994 Development Plan, the University has undertaken a thorough assessment of its overall strategy and produced a document in support of this application titled “Campus Development – Justification for Expansion”. This comprehensively deals with why the University needs to expand, whilst this section provides a broad summary.

The Vision

2.3 Warwick’s vision is to become a universally acknowledged world centre of higher education by 2015 (its 50th anniversary), firmly in the top 50 of world universities.

2.4 To achieve this requires the university to pursue the following strategic ambitions:

- increase its international reputation for the very best research and teaching
- continue to attract the highest quality staff and students by virtue of its reputation and its supportive yet challenging community
- reach out to relevant stakeholders particularly in business, industry and government, but also the wider community, to win their support
- position Warwick as an intellectual gateway to the UK and beyond by bringing sharper focus to regional, national and international engagement so that Warwick is perceived as a key node on the international map of higher education
- generate a substantial increase in income to realise these ambitions, particularly through research growth
- make the Warwick campus into a representation of the University’s strength of ambition and quality of imagination, distinguished by environmental quality, the highest standards of design, and a supportive collegial atmosphere.

2.5 These ambitions can be translated into four broad strategic goals:

GOAL 1: to make Warwick an undisputed World Leader in research and scholarship

2.6 It is imperative to produce an environment in which excellent research can thrive. This is
the University’s central aspiration which will drive all other activities. A range of proposals are under consideration including an Institute of Advanced Study for international research exchange, further interdisciplinary Science Centres, selected research collaborations with overseas partners, and new buildings and equipment appropriate for world-class research.

GOAL 2: to make the Warwick teaching and learning experience unique

2.7 Whilst research is the lifeblood of a university like Warwick, teaching and learning are essential building blocks in the sharing and development of knowledge and the formation of enquiring and critical minds. Proposals include a 50% increase in postgraduate research student numbers by 2015, potential changes to undergraduate programmes, continued investment in pedagogic innovation and the provision of appropriate high quality teaching and learning spaces to accommodate these future needs.

GOAL 3: to make the University into an International Portal

2.8 The University wishes to increase its international profile as a result of the above two goals and will therefore continue the tradition of receiving and sending staff and students from all corners of the world and also seek to establish an International Quarter made up of the overseas operations of some of the world’s leading research universities.

GOAL 4: to enhance the University’s reputation with stakeholders in the UK

2.9 Warwick’s ‘working region’ does not easily map onto existing city and regional areas, but the University will seek to capitalise on its ‘gateway’ location between Coventry and Warwickshire, the Birmingham City Region and wider West and East Midlands, the centre of England and the whole of the UK. Engagement with the public sector to support policy and professional development will be a key feature of this approach.

What This Means for the Campus

2.10 It is a central aspiration of the University to provide a mix of activities in all parts of the campus to create a vibrant sustainable community, where active interaction between students and staff allows ideas to be easily exchanged. Buildings of the future will include interdisciplinary research centres and doctoral training centres, flexible-use
accommodation to respond quickly to commercial opportunities, interactive and collaborative space making research available to the public including through the learning grid, more living accommodation on campus for staff, students and visitors.

2.11 The need to build on its existing campus rather than set up a satellite site elsewhere is integral to its future success. If the campus were to operate from separate sites, this would have a detrimental effect on interdisciplinary research, it would significantly increase management and administration costs, result in the duplication of key support facilities, and lead to a substantial increase in travel overall both to and between campuses.

2.12 The campus is therefore a vital element in symbolising what Warwick stands for, culminating in being voted the best campus in the UK in a 2005 THES student poll. However, it is also criticised for being rather sterile, lacking social opportunities, non-descript and low-key design, and failing both to create a sense of place and to declare its presence, particularly in the form of entrances. The University therefore wishes to consolidate what is good about the campus and create a better place to live, study and work: a genuine campus community.

2.13 Warwick is also a socially responsible institution and wishes to take an environmental lead by creating a “green” campus through policy, physical expression and influencing behaviour.

2.14 A key supporting strategy for this Vision is the Campus Masterplan (prepared by McCormac Jamieson Prichard and one of the supporting documents for this application). It draws on the founding principles of the University from 1964, which foresaw a flexible plan to allow for growth and changing requirements, and was based on the fundamental decision to plan the university on a united basis – bringing humanities and sciences together. The 2007 masterplan has 8 overall project objectives:

OBJECTIVE 1: to plan for sustainable long term growth of the university to meet its strategic goals and Government objectives for higher education

OBJECTIVE 2: to plan for an integrated university optimising the use of its established successful campus

OBJECTIVE 3: to foster a ‘campus community’ where staff, students and those external to the university can come together to learn, study, research and interact to further human knowledge and understanding

OBJECTIVE 4: to provide a robust and flexible framework for development of the campus
to meet current and future needs

OBJECTIVE 5: to provide residential accommodation on or near campus for a high proportion of students and an increasing number of staff to maximise their contribution to campus life

OBJECTIVE 6: to manage travel demand through a sustainable transport strategy to maximise accessibility of the university whilst mitigating the impact of traffic congestion on the area

OBJECTIVE 7: to pursue a sustainable future for the university and demonstrate long term stewardship of the environment by protecting and enhancing landscape character

OBJECTIVE 8: to develop further as a social and economic asset to the local community and the region, in broad accordance with governmental policy objectives

2.15 The need for flexibility in responding to the competing demands and needs across the full range of University activities – research, teaching and commercial, as well as the appropriate levels of residential accommodation and support facilities – means that Warwick must anticipate making full use of its historic 1965 campus over the next 10 years.

2.16 Based on its vision and overall project objectives, a series of ‘targets’ were determined by the University Buildings Committee and in turn endorsed by Council. Essentially over the 10 year period of the masterplan (2008-18), these can be summarised as:

- a doubling of research activity
- a modest increase in student numbers, principally postgraduates
- expansion of ‘third leg’ and commercial activities
- a proportional growth in support facilities

2.17 It is estimated that these forecasts will result in an additional 171,000 sq m over what exists today generating an extra 4000 staff and students. This is a 40% increase in the overall campus footprint and, over the masterplan period, broadly mirrors the historic growth rate. It is also consistent with space planning standards in the HE sector.
3. **Description of the Site and Proposed Development**

3.1 The application site comprises 189ha of land on the south-west fringes of Coventry, bordering open countryside. This consists of four areas of main campus:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Campus Area</th>
<th>Local Authority</th>
<th>Site Area</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Central Campus West</td>
<td>Warwick District</td>
<td>89.27 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Campus East</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>67.53 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gibbet Hill</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>7.23 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westwood</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>23.51 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milburn House</td>
<td>Coventry</td>
<td>1.52 ha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>189.06 ha</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2 Central Campus West and East is bisected by Gibbet Hill Road which runs from Kirby Corner Road in the north-west to the A429 Kenilworth Road in the south-east. Central Campus East contains the bulk of the present University built estate including the Students Union, Arts Centre, Library, major academic faculties and University administration (now housed in the former National Grid offices at Kirby Corner Road).

3.3 To the north-east of the Central Campus is Cannon Park which is an area of low density housing separated from the campus by landscape features. Immediately to the north lies the Cannon Park District Shopping Centre and University of Warwick Science Park. The recent acquisition of Milburn House on the Science Park provides opportunities to improve links to Westwood Campus, which is situated to the north of Kirby Corner Road.

3.4 Westwood is a former teaching training college which now forms part of the University and borders the residential area of Canley to the north, whilst to the west, beyond University running track and tennis courts is Westwood Business Park, a low density office campus.

3.5 Gibbet Hill Campus is situated to the south-east of Central Campus East separated from it by the valley of Canley Brook which includes meadows, Tocil Woods and a wetlands nature reserve. To the east of Gibbet Hill lies further low density housing.

3.6 Central Campus West lies in Warwickshire and contains the post-experience centres such as Radcliffe and Scarman House, postgraduate residential accommodation and the University’s main sports pitches and pavilion. There is a loop road connecting Central Campus West which runs from the roundabout near Canley Brook round to the main roundabout which provides the main entrance to University Road.

3.7 The west and southerly aspects of the University open onto countryside currently devoted
to agricultural use and woodland coppice. Beyond this to the south lies the settlement of Kenilworth and to the west, Burton Green.

3.8 The principal accesses to the University are from the A429 Kenilworth Road and Kirby Corner Road, both of which connect to the A45 Fletchampstead Highway through southern Coventry, and via Stoneleigh Road to the A46 in the east.

3.9 The site is more fully described in the Main Campus Masterplan.

**History of the University’s Development**

3.10 The University of Warwick was established in 1964, as part of Government strategy to expand higher education. Land was gifted to the University for this purpose by the local authorities and the original planning permissions issued by both Coventry (then a City Corporation) and Warwick (then an Urban District Council) required “a detailed plan and programmes to be submitted in order to ensure a high standard of layout and design, satisfactory flow of traffic, economic provision of services and release of land of high agricultural quality only when required for development.”

3.11 The initial Development Plan envisaged a university of 15,000 students, rising eventually to 20,000, on a 400 acre (160ha) campus stretching from the edge of Coventry, across Gibbet Hill Road and into the Warwickshire countryside. Successive development plans have been predicated on the campus ultimately expanding to fulfil its 1964 vision. Of particular relevance, the Warwickshire land has been Green Belt since its designation in 1960.

3.12 Early development focussed on Central Campus East and Gibbet Hill, where infrastructure was made available. This included the Library, Students Union, Senate building, major academic faculties and later the Arts Centre. It was not until 1972 that the first development on Central Campus West was approved in the form of residential accommodation for 600 students at Cryfield. Later developments in Warwickshire followed in the 1980s including Radcliffe House (the MBA Teaching Centre), Scarman House, part of Warwick Business School, the Sports Pavilion (and associated pitches) and most recently the Lakeside and Heronbank student residences. A perimeter road linking the two roundabouts on Gibbet Hill Road was also built and provides access to all the remaining parcels of land on Central Campus West.

3.13 Although the earliest development plans envisaged a construction period of 30 years (1965-1995), the mid-1990s arrived with large tracts of land still undeveloped. The latest Development Plan was adopted in 1995 by both Coventry and Warwick Councils as
Supplementary Planning Guidance, and allowed for further student accommodation on Central Campus West between the site of Lakeside residences and the sports facilities with a further potential site to meet “unforeseen opportunities or unpredictable changes in operational requirements” to the west.

3.14 With its end date of 2004 approaching, the University appointed MacCormac Jamieson Prichard (MJP) as development plan architects to undertake a review of the previous Development Plan and to roll it forward.

3.15 More detail on the history of the university’s development can be found in the Campus Masterplan document.

**The Proposed Development 2008-18**

3.16 The University and its development plan architects undertook a comprehensive review of the existing estate and the demands which were likely to emerge in terms of teaching, research, administrative and support functions, and residential accommodation. This is set out in the Main Campus Masterplan and Justification for Expansion documents.

**OVERALL FLOORSPACE REQUIREMENTS**

3.17 This exercise identified an overall requirement for 225,000 square metres GEA over the next 10 years, comprising 65,000 square metres for academic uses (teaching and research); 23,000 square metres for other university uses such as arts centre, management training, students union, retail and new initiatives; 26,000 square metres for support facilities such as administration, library, social space, catering and sports; and 111,000 square metres for student accommodation.

3.18 The masterplanning exercise quickly established that the campus did not have the capacity for the full 225,000 square metres and this led to the decision that some of the residential accommodation would have to be delivered off-campus, but ideally close by. The exercise identified that the campus could accommodate 171,000 square metres, approximately half on the Coventry land but importantly half on the Warwickshire Land. At least 2,000 residential units will be provided on campus.

3.19 This is split as shown over the page:
Table 1: Campus Masterplan Floorspace Proposals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Central Campus East</th>
<th>Central Campus West</th>
<th>Westwood Campus</th>
<th>Gibbet Hill Campus</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Academic</td>
<td>33,750</td>
<td>20,400</td>
<td>7,550</td>
<td>3,300</td>
<td>65,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>14,900</td>
<td>8,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>23,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support**</td>
<td>12,950</td>
<td>12,300</td>
<td>2,050</td>
<td>-1,300</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>15,900</td>
<td>41,100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>57,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>77,500</td>
<td>81,900</td>
<td>9,600</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>171,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All figures are square metres GEA

* includes Arts Centre, Management Training, Retail, Students Union, new initiatives
** includes administration, library, social, catering and sports

MASTERPLAN PRINCIPLES

3.20 The masterplan intends to provide a flexible but robust framework for the location of future buildings, key routes, squares and landscape to create a coherent environment, integrating the four campus areas and reinforcing links with the surrounding communities. It includes zoning of academic departments and other activities to promote interaction and support a lively campus community, and one that is safe and inclusive.

3.21 Amongst the core aspirations are the promotion of a sense of place, which is principally achieved through reinforcing the main structure of routes and in particular the two main axes – from University House along University Road and along Library Road and out into Central Campus West. The former builds on an existing strong route, whereas the latter foresees creating a new route out into the Warwickshire land. The second aspect of this approach is the extension of the existing network of nodes, or centres of activity, to promote social and academic interaction.

3.22 The masterplan is also about sustainable development, from remaining true to the founding principles of a single campus for study, work and living, to the “greening” of the campus and the construction of sustainable buildings and the use of sustainable technologies. Protection of the environment and retention of key landscape features (particularly the Hilltop area on Central Campus West which is also of archaeological interest) are also important facets of the masterplan.

SITE DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS

3.23 Within Central Campus East, potential sites have been identified around Academic Square
(where the new Digital Lab is under construction), between Academic Square and University House and on the car park of University House (where the replacement Estates Office is to be built), several surface car parks along University Road, to the south-west of the Arts Centre, and land adjacent to the Rootes and Tocil residences. Most of these are consistent with earlier development plans and will see this part of campus achieve its full potential without increasing density to an overly urban scale.

3.24 Within Central Campus West, a series of development sites have been identified which are broadly consistent with those in the 1994 Development Plan and are located either side of the loop road. These have been chosen to have least visual impact, such as on lower ground adjacent to the loop road and screened by Whitefield Coppice. As a consequence of the decision to create a new axis extending from Library Road around Radcliffe House, the new masterplan departs from the 1994 plan in identifying development along this axis, to the east of the Heronbank residences, to link through to the new node by Whitefield Coppice.

3.25 No new development is proposed any further south than the existing sports pavilion which is the closest building to Kenilworth.

3.26 At Westwood Campus, there is potential to accommodate expansion through selective redevelopment of buildings which have reached the end of their life, and some infill. A more intensive use of the site combined with higher quality development would improve the visual character and liveliness of this area. There is also a proposal for an indoor tennis centre, which has planning permission.

3.27 The University’s acquisition of Millburn House on the Science Park presents a further opportunity to link Central Campus East with Westwood.

3.28 There is only limited capacity for development at the Gibbet Hill Campus. Two existing plots have been identified for redevelopment (including the Estates Office) and it is envisaged that this would allow for some expansion of existing academic (teaching and research) activities, particularly an extension of the Medical School.

3.29 The proposed development is split into two equal 5 year phases. The first 5 represents the outplaying of the emerging Capital Projects Plan, which is a rolling 5 year programme of capital expenditure. This includes projects such as:

- Relocation of the Estates Office to University House
- The Indoor Tennis Centre at Westwood
- The Digital Laboratory at Academic Square
- Further phases of expansion at Warwick Business School, the Medical School, and
Mathematics & Statistics

- A new Olympic-sized swimming pool adjacent to the sports centre
- A new social facility to serve the existing residences on Central Campus West
- A ‘zero carbon’ housing project

3.30 As part of the first phase, a major academic department or research use is likely to be located on the Warwickshire Land.

TRANSPORT AND ACCESS PROPOSALS

3.31 The development proposed over the next 10 years represents a 40% increase on today’s floorspace and staff levels. If existing car parking levels on campus, which are already 125% of PPG13 standards, were to be provided in the same proportions, unacceptable levels of congestion would arise at local junctions.

3.32 It is therefore essential for the University to develop a sustainable transport strategy, recognising the significant potential to reduce the number of single occupancy car trips to and from campus. For example, a car parking strategy is proposed that sets standards well below the maximum level set by PPG13 (1:2 for staff and 1:15 for students living off campus), and will remove free parking over the whole campus to bring about a reduction in car park availability and encourage car sharing and other sustainable modes. Over the 10 year period, this would mean an additional 448 car parking spaces (including 27 disabled spaces) – a 9% increase compared to the 40% in floorspace/staff.

3.33 This would be linked to proposals to develop the cycle network, provide improved pedestrian facilities, particularly crossing Gibbet Hill Road, and support the Bus Rapid Transit proposals currently being promoted by Coventry City Council.

3.34 It is anticipated that this strategy will mean that the increase in peak hour trips over the 10 year period will amount to just 12%, a level which can be accommodated on an improved road network. These improvements include:

- changes to the junction of Gibbet Hill Road and Kenilworth Road to increase capacity and pedestrian facilities
- closure of the junction of Library Road with Gibbet Hill Road other than for buses, cycles and pedestrians and creation of a pedestrian friendly shared use environment along Library Road
- provision of a new roundabout at the junction of University Road and Gibbet Hill Road, close to the Arts Centre and Students Union to enable two-way traffic to circulate around University Road
- improvements to Gibbet Hill Road including pedestrian crossing facilities
3.35 The University supports the proposals for a Bus Rapid Transit system which would connect the campus with Coventry City Centre, and can accommodate a route through campus. It will also support the delivery of public transport services in addition to the 400 buses per weekday which already serve the campus, including provision of an express service between the City Centre, rail station and University in advance of the BRT. The University will also work with partners to provide high quality infrastructure, including a new link from Cannon Park Shopping Centre through campus.

3.36 The footway and cycleway network around campus would be strengthened, with measures to avoid vehicular conflicts in support of more sustainable forms of travel, and support for a permissive route for the National Cycle Network across University land. Increased levels of student accommodation on or near campus, as well as proposals for staff housing on campus, would assist in promoting walking and cycling.

3.37 A Travel Plan is proposed to guide the move towards more sustainable transport choices and, following the appointment of a Travel Co-ordinator to oversee implementation, it will monitor transport modes, traffic generation and car parking against targets. This information will be shared with the highway authorities.

**PROPOSED HEADS OF TERMS FOR SECTION 106 AGREEMENT**

3.38 The Section 106 Agreement is for negotiation with the local planning and highway authorities, but it is envisaged that this will include provision of off-site highway works based on a schedule to be approved and including:

- New roundabout at the junction of University Road (South) with Gibbet Hill Road.
- Provision of ‘Lynchgate Link’ route for buses, University traffic, pedestrians and cyclists only off Lynchgate Road. This route is not available for general traffic.
- Improvement of the Gibbet Hill Road frontage to the Central Campus area including pavements, boundary treatments, soft landscaping, lighting and removal of redundant footway crossings.
- Provision of a new signal controlled crossing on Gibbet Hill Road to the east of Scarman Road roundabout. Improvements to the two existing signal controlled crossings on Gibbet Hill Road near Library Road and near Cryfield.
- Improvements to the Gibbet Hill site access with the provision of a ghost island right turn facility.
- Improvements to the Kenilworth Road / Gibbet Hill Road signal junction.
- Closure of the Library Road access to Gibbet Hill Road to all vehicles except buses cyclists and pedestrians.
3.39 Preliminary design for the off-site Highway Works can be seen on Drawing nos. 7-10 in the Transport Assessment

LANDSCAPE STRATEGY

3.40 The University’s landscape strategy is set out in the Campus Masterplan document.

3.41 It aims to build on the outstanding quality of the existing campus landscape whilst offering protection to those features that are most sensitive, and enriching habitat potential. It seeks to provide visual structure and a clear sense of place, and uses research and development as a starting point for new strategies to develop a landscape based on the principles of sustainability.

3.42 The strategy is based around four overlapping geometries:

- Within the Warwickshire land, the landscape will seek to draw on the pattern and scale of surrounding field patterns, creating a series of compartments into which new buildings will be placed
- The axial geometry of the original campus will be drawn across Gibbet Hill Road onto the Warwickshire land, creating new avenues
- The established axes along University Road and Library Road will be reinforced
- The structure of hedgerows which encircle campus and follow main watercourses will be reinforced.

3.43 Biomass is under consideration as a primary source of heat and energy, including growing energy crops on University land on and around campus.
4. Planning Policy Considerations

4.1 The planning policy considerations for this application are markedly different between those affecting the Coventry and Warwickshire land. The development proposed on non-Green Belt land in Coventry effectively consolidates the existing campus through infill and some redevelopment and is generally consistent with adopted policy, whereas the development proposed in the Warwickshire Green Belt requires the strongest justification.

4.2 Section 38(6) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 requires that proposals be determined in accordance with the development plan unless material considerations indicate otherwise. In this case, the development plan comprises:

- the Coventry Unitary Development Plan (2001)
- the Warwickshire Structure Plan (2001)

4.3 A review of the Warwick District Local Plan is well advanced with an Inspector’s report recently issued (May 2007) following an inquiry in 2006. This plan is considered material to the current planning application and is afforded some weight.

4.4 A review of the RSS is also underway but is at a very early stage (Spatial Options), as is the preparation of a Core Strategy for Coventry’s LDF (Issues and Options) and therefore neither are afforded any weight. The Warwickshire Structure Plan is only saved until September 2007 and is therefore afforded less weight.

4.5 Other material considerations include the range of Planning Policy Guidance Notes and Statements issued by Central Government. The 1994 University of Warwick Development Plan, which was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance by both Coventry City and Warwick District Councils in 1995 is also relevant although this is regarded as out-of-date.

Regional Spatial Strategy

4.6 The West Midlands RSS was approved in June 2004 and sets out how the region should develop over the period to 2021. As it was prepared under the old system, an early review was recommended by the Secretary of State which is being broken down into three phases. The first (dealing with the Black Country) does not affect Warwick, but Phase 2 is reviewing housing, employment, centres and transport policies.
4.7 The Phase 2 Review was launched in November 2005. The Spatial Options document was subject to public consultation in early 2007 and the next stage will involve the preparation of Preferred Options by December 2007.

4.8 The Phase 3 Review is intended to cover critical rural services, recreational provision, regionally significant environmental issues, and a framework for gypsy and traveller sites. It is not anticipated to review the Green Belt as was originally hoped by the University.

4.9 The WMRSS identifies a number of towns and cities in the Region where major development should be focused. This includes Coventry which is designated as a ‘Major Urban Area’.

4.10 Policy SS6 provides guidance on Green Belts and ‘urban renaissance’. It aims to maintain the current Green Belts surrounding the metropolitan area, but recognises that some adjustments of the inner boundaries may be justified in order to provide opportunities for selective employment development.

4.11 The economic policies of the WMRSS encourage the development of a highly trained workforce in the region, foster new high-growth employment sectors and seek to enable existing economic activities to modernise and to stay competitive. Of particular relevance is the commitment in Policy PA4 to fostering the growth of Universities:

‘Development plans should facilitate the needs of higher/further education institutions and research facilities to grow and expand.’

4.12 The introduction to this policy focuses on ‘clusters’ requiring physical proximity to research and HE establishments and provides an acknowledgement that institutions like the University of Warwick University are important sources of innovation and critical to the future of the region’s economy. Development plans are charged with facilitating their appropriate expansion and the close location of new, emerging and as yet unforeseen forms of economic activity where there is a need for physical proximity.

4.13 The policy goes on to advocate that:

“development plans should consider the need for physical enhancement and expansion of existing educational and research facilities to ensure that the educational, training and research potential of the region can be realised” (para 7.25);

“in the case of universities, particular emphasis should be given to developing their research and development capabilities and the further encouragement of links with
business, particularly with knowledge-based industries” (para 7.26).

“implementation of this policy will require partnership working between local planning authorities, relevant education and research establishments and those involved in economic development” (para 7.27)

4.14 Other relevant polices include Policy PA1: B(iv) which gives a commitment to “developing the skills and abilities of the West Midlands people by improving access to training, higher education and employment opportunities”.

4.15 Policy PA3 on high technology corridors identifies a corridor based on Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire where cluster development, closely linked to research, development and advanced technologies will be promoted. It makes specific reference to the “universities and their science parks” as examples of “critical research bases” where new incubator space should be provided (para 7.18) and to HE establishments representing key nodes where corridor development should occur (para 7.20).

Coventry UDP

4.16 The Coventry Unitary Development plan (1996-2011) was adopted in 2001. Policy SCL6 provides general guidance on the provision of educational facilities in the City, stating that:

“The City Council will support new, expanded and improved educational facilities in suitable locations where the environmental impact of the proposal is acceptable in the nearby area”.

4.17 It acknowledges the importance of its two universities for employment, community and leisure roles as well as their educational responsibilities.

4.18 Policy SCL9 is a site specific policy which deals with the University of Warwick and identifies the extent of its Coventry campus on the Proposals Map. None of this land is in the Green Belt. The policy favours university growth within its boundary and makes reference to the University Development Plan SPG against which proposals for new development will be considered (see below).

4.19 Coventry City Council is in the process of preparing its Local Development Framework. The Local Development Scheme was updated in April 2007 and a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) was adopted in November 2006. Initial consultation on a Core Strategy took place in Spring 2006, although there was limited mention of the role
of universities. A further consultation exercise is due to take place during 2007 and adoption is unlikely to occur before July 2009.

**Warwickshire Structure Plan**

4.20 The Warwickshire Structure Plan (1996-2011) was also adopted in 2001 and is currently saved until September 2007. The policies which are intended to be saved beyond this date have recently been notified to the Regional Assembly for their endorsement.

4.21 One of the strategic constraints (recognised in Policy GD.4) is the West Midlands Green Belt, which in Warwickshire: ‘serves to prevent the spread of the built-up areas of Coventry and the Birmingham conurbation into open countryside; maintains a rural setting for the towns in Warwickshire; preserves the special character of historic towns and areas of open countryside, and supports urban regeneration’.

4.22 The Plan defines the general extent of the Green Belt which in this area runs to the county boundary, which equates to Gibbet Hill Road through campus.

4.23 Policy GD.6 provides more detailed guidance on Green Belt and reflects the guidance in PPG2 that there should be a general presumption against inappropriate development within the Green Belt. The plan recognises that in the interests of sustainable development, authorities may exceptionally need to review the boundaries of settlements excluded from and on the edge of the Green Belt. This could apply particularly where development might contribute significantly to the objective of reducing the need to travel.

4.24 The supporting text only refers to pressures from large scale employment sites and provides no guidance on the consideration of other regionally significant land uses such as universities.

4.25 The Structure Plan is silent on the role of higher education in the County but refers in Policy TC3 to the need to make provision for, inter alia, education within local plans.

**Warwick District Local Plan**

4.26 The Warwick District Local Plan was adopted in 1995. This defines the inner boundary of the Green Belt running along Gibbet Hill Road, in accordance with the Structure Plan general extent. This means all of the University’s Warwickshire land is in Green Belt.
4.27 The Plan contains a site-specific policy (EMP8) relating to the University of Warwick, which states that proposals for the campus will normally be given ‘favourable consideration’ as long as relevant criteria are met in relation to the suitability of educational uses, impact on the Special Landscape Area, impact on the local highway network and accordance with Green Belt policy.

4.28 The supporting text recognises the University’s importance locally and nationally as an educational resource, in its cultural role, and its academic research function. It states that “the Council wishes to continue to support the role performed by the University by giving favourable consideration to proposals related directly to the University’s academic function”. This specifically recognises Government policy to encourage more people to undertake higher and further education.

4.29 The plan favours preparation of a brief to “build upon the historical and locational reasons for the continued development of the University” and states that this will need to “address and identify the ‘very special circumstances’ that justify development in this Green Belt location”. Individual applications that accord with the policy and brief would then be supported by the Council and referred to the Secretary of State (as required by PPG2) on that basis.

4.30 The brief referred to is the University Development Plan (1994-2004) which was approved by Warwick District Council in November 1995 as Supplementary Planning Guidance – and is covered in more detail below.

Warwick District Local Plan Review

4.31 A Local Plan Review is at an advanced stage of preparation. This commenced with publication of a First Deposit Plan in November 2003 and a Second Deposit Plan in July 2005. A Public Inquiry was held between April and September 2006 and the Inspector’s Report was published in May 2007.

4.32 The First Deposit did not address the University’s existence and effectively removed the site specific policy which had provided the basis for development over the last 10 years. After discussion with Government Office about the appropriateness of a specific policy supporting university development, the Revised Deposit designated the University’s land in Warwick District as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt (MDS). Draft policy SSP2 allowed infill and redevelopment for employment purposes without the requirement to demonstrate very special circumstances.

4.33 The Revised Deposit Green Belt policy (DAP1) noted that there should be an ongoing general presumption against inappropriate development but that certain forms of
development would be permitted including "development within major developed sites, in accordance with Policy SSP2".

4.34 The University made representations to the Local Plan Review, generally supporting the MDS designation, subject to minor amendment of its boundaries.

4.35 The Inspector’s Report of May 2007 acknowledges that the adopted Local Plan was prepared prior to the 1995 version of PPG2 which introduced the MDS concept and that the Local Plan contained a site specific policy for the University which had provided the basis for the planning brief in the form of the University Development Plan SPG.

4.36 The Inspector notes that discussions took place between the District Council, the University and GOWM during which three options were considered: (1) removing the site from the Green Belt; (2) a bespoke policy for the University; and (3) to designate the site as a MDS in accordance with Annex C of PPG2. He reports that the District Council decided on (3) as taking some 42ha out of the Green Belt would be a strategic change of such magnitude that it should properly be made by the Structure Plan or, now, the RSS. It was also difficult to see what form a policy should take given the need for new development in the Green Belt to comply with PPG2.

4.37 The Inspector agrees that MDS status is the appropriate way forward given the Green Belt context and support for higher education institutions expressed in Policy PA4 of the WMRSS. Stoneleigh and Ashow Parish Council made representations to contest the amount of Green Belt land being developed by the University. The Inspector recognises that the boundaries of the MDS have been defined in a rather different manner from those of the other designated MDS as the proposed area is one where there has been no previous development. However, he considers that the University Development Plan SPG is a material consideration in defining the area and since it was subject to public consultation at the time of its preparation, it is reasonable to accommodate the commitments made in that Plan. The Inspector concludes that the proposed MDS boundaries are not too generous.

4.38 The Inspector supports the amended boundary proposed by the University to address the small discrepancy in the MDS boundary shown in the Revised Deposit Plan. This therefore encompasses all the development areas shown in the University Development Plan SPG.

4.39 In responding to the University’s concern about MDS designation, the Inspector does not consider Policy SSP2 to be overly restrictive in relation to future development at the University and feels that it achieves an appropriate balance between Green Belt policy and fulfilling the aspirations of the University set out in its 1994 Development Plan.
4.40 In relation to Paragraph 10.17C, the Inspector agrees with the District Council that it would not be appropriate to seek to accommodate all students on the site and resist student accommodation elsewhere in the District as this would unfairly discriminate between students from different institutions, put undue pressure on Green Belt land, and could prove harmful to the vitality of town centres in particular.

4.41 The amended paragraphs of the Plan as recommended by the Inspector are:

Paragraph 10.17A to read:

“University of Warwick. The University is a world class higher education institution which, from its inception in 1964, has occupied land gifted by the Councils of Coventry and Warwickshire, the latter having been in the West Midlands Green Belt. Whilst the majority of growth to date has been on the Coventry side of the boundary, the University has always recognised from its earliest development plans that future growth would rely on the use of the Warwickshire land. The University now considers that this land is critical to sustaining its vision for the long term.”

Paragraph 10.17B to read:

“The previous local plan, adopted in 1995, contained a policy supporting development at the University and set the framework for a planning brief to be prepared. This brief, the University Development Plan 1994-2004, was adopted as supplementary planning guidance in 1995. It has not to date been fully implemented and remains an appropriate framework against which proposals at the University are considered. Any revisions or updates to this plan, which have been through the relevant adoption process, will be accorded significant weight in determining future applications for development.”

Paragraph 10.17C to read:

“The Council supports the University as a higher education institution of national importance, and is keen to ensure its continued success. The Regional Spatial Strategy both supports development at Higher Education Establishments and recognises the University’s location within the Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire Hi-Technology corridor. It is important, however, that this is done having regard to all relevant environmental safeguards and in particular its designation as Green Belt. Identifying the site as a major developed site within which the various university uses can expand is the most appropriate means of doing this. An area of 42 hectares has been identified for this purpose, which reflects the outer limit to development as defined by the University Development Plan 1994-2004.”

4.42 Warwick District Council is in the process of formulating its first Local Development
Framework (LDF). The Local Development Scheme was brought into effect in January 2007 following approval by the Secretary of State. This envisages the initial stages of preparing a Core Strategy for the District commencing later this year with adoption unlikely to occur before June 2010.

4.43 As part of the LDF, the Council has prepared a Statement of Community Involvement (SCI) which has been subject to public consultation and has been submitted to the Secretary of State.

**University Development Plan SPG**

4.44 The University of Warwick has a long tradition of development plans going back to the original Ling Goodman plan of 1964. The most recent plan by Casson Condor was approved by the University in 1994 covering the 10 year period to 2004. It was adopted as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) by both Warwick District and Coventry City Councils in 1995.

4.45 The plan foresaw the University’s expansion in all academic areas, with a commensurate need for communal facilities, student and staff housing and post experience training. A decision was made to relocate most of the playing fields in Central Campus from the Coventry to the Warwickshire land, enabling the University to consolidate its sports pitches in Green Belt (where these are appropriate uses) and place most of its academic development on non-Green Belt land in Coventry. Most of the future residential accommodation was proposed on the Warwickshire land.

4.46 This plan is now out-of-date and is superceded by the current application proposals. However, it is still a material consideration recognised as recently as May 2007 by the Local Plan Inspector.

**Regional Economic Strategy**

4.47 Regional Economic Strategies are prepared by the regional development agencies – in this case Advantage West Midlands (AWM) – and should align with the RSS. They are therefore a further material consideration.

4.48 The West Midlands Regional Economic Strategy (RES) runs from 2004-2010. It divides the region’s economy into four ‘pillars’. Pillar 1 is concerned with developing a diverse and dynamic base, Pillar 2 with promoting a learning and skilful region, Pillar 3 with
creating conditions for growth and Pillar 4 with regenerating communities.

4.49 The overall aim of Pillar 2 is to create a highly skilled, innovative and adaptable workforce to attract and support the growth of high value jobs and wealth creating businesses. It is anticipated that this will lead to increased income for the workforce, and ensure that all people have the skills they need to take advantage of the job opportunities which become available.

4.50 Pillar 2 principles recognise the importance of a graduate workforce, stating that:

‘Graduates are essential to the growth of our economy and although the West Midlands has a relatively high level of business innovation, the overall knowledge economy remains weak and participation in higher education is below national average. Initiatives to support the employment and retention of skilled graduates in the region are crucial, particularly within high value added industries’.

4.51 The RES is in the process of being reviewed and a draft strategy is currently being consulted on, with a view to being adopted in September 2007. The draft looks forward to 2020 and establishes a vision for the West Midlands to be a world-class region.

4.52 The key economic challenge is to raise the economic output per head of population to the same level as the UK average, which currently represents a £10bn ‘output gap’. The draft RES analysis concludes that low rates of innovation and a poor record on skills are the primary sources of the region’s productivity challenge. The region performs poorly on school attainment, levels of qualifications in the workforce, graduate retention, leadership and management, and work-based training and ranks in the bottom quartile of regions on most skills indicators.

4.53 The importance of the Region’s universities are recognised and acknowledged throughout the draft Strategy, providing strong policy support for their expansion and growth. Exploiting economic strengths and opportunities presented by university expansion are clearly established within the Strategy. The WMES recognises the value of graduates to the regional economy and the need to enhance links between business and academia, particularly in relation to innovation.

4.54 Under the ‘Business’ theme, the ‘Exploiting Knowledge’ section identifies two important objectives which the growth and expansion of the University of Warwick will contribute towards:

- The ‘Investing in High Value Skills’ objective aims to increase the number of people with graduate level skills employed in the West Midlands economy by upskilling the
current workforce and recruiting and retaining more people with the skills needed to develop and deliver higher value added products and services. The draft RES recognises that the region’s private sector needs to rely upon and utilise greater amounts of graduate level skills. The draft RES states that:

"A further 160,000 people with graduate level skills need to be employed or self-employed in the West Midlands, particularly in the private sector. The region needs to encourage greater numbers of the graduates produced by our universities to stay and work in the West Midlands and to stimulate a stronger flow of graduate level skills from within the workforce.” (p.35, WMES, Consultation Draft, May 2007)

- The ‘Exploiting Regional Knowledge Assets’ objective aims to take the West Midlands to the forefront of intellectual property development and the commercialisation of opportunities generated by the region’s research institutions and businesses. It recognises that the region has a strong research and development base within its universities, hospitals and other public sector institutions as well as its businesses and private sector R&D facilities, but generally poor levels of investment in R&D. It states that improved knowledge exchange demands focused attention on finance for R&D, support for businesses to commission and exploit knowledge-based innovation, a commitment to design and Intellectual Property creation and encouragement for increased spin-out and licensing.

This objective includes an ‘indicative action’ to promote the region’s knowledge base to businesses through an improved gateway to university expertise, which increases the volume and quality of SME engagement and better promotes our knowledge assets externally. It also seeks to increase the volume of collaborative business-led research and development through Science City demonstrator activity, Knowledge Transfer Partnerships and business networks to support knowledge and staff exchange.

4.55 In delivering these objectives, the draft RES identifies three primary areas for spatial focus: (1) areas of multiple market failure and disadvantage; (2) concentrations of knowledge assets; and (3) the City of Birmingham. Clearly the second spatial focus is relevant as it acknowledges that there are parts of the region where knowledge assets such as research institutions, HE institutions, research-intensive businesses and suitable property opportunities are concentrated. The draft RES recognises that there are important opportunities to build on and exploit in these areas. The areas are principally recognised in the three High Technology Corridors – the University of Warwick falls within the Coventry/Solihull/Warwickshire HTC.
National Planning Policy

4.56 Other material considerations include national planning policy as set out in PPS and PPG format. Briefly, those of most relevance to the University of Warwick include:

**PPS1 (2005): Delivering Sustainable Development**

4.57 PPS1 sets out the Government’s objectives for the planning system and promotes making suitable land available for development in line with economic, social and environmental objectives to improve peoples’ quality of life; contributing to sustainable economic development; protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment, the quality and character of the countryside and existing communities; ensuring high quality development through good and inclusive design and efficient use of resources; and ensuring development supports communities and contributes to the creation of safe, sustainable, liveable and mixed communities with access to jobs and key services.

**PPG2 (1995): Green Belts**

4.58 The fundamental aim and intention of Green Belt is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The guidance provides five purposes for including land within a Green Belt, namely:

- to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas
- to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another
- to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment
- to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns, and
- to assist urban regeneration.

4.59 Without compromising openness, land included in Green Belt may then perform a number of positive roles. Appropriate uses include providing opportunities for access to the countryside; outdoor sport; retaining and enhancing attractive landscapes; improving damaged and derelict land; securing nature conservation interests, and retaining land in agricultural or forestry related use.

4.60 The essential characteristic of Green Belts is their permanence so that, once established, boundaries should not be altered other than in exceptional circumstances. With very limited exceptions, new buildings in Green Belt are regarded as ‘inappropriate development’ which is by definition harmful. Inappropriate development can only be permitted in ‘very special circumstances’ where the harm is outweighed by other considerations.
Annex C to PPG.2 addresses the future of major developed sites in the Green Belt. In contrast to earlier policy, it brings higher and further education establishments within the scope of control applied to other development in the Green Belt, but nevertheless takes an encouraging view, noting at Para C16, that:

“It is however Government policy to encourage more people to undertake higher education. There has been a large increase in student numbers and further increases can be expected. The lack of a reasonable alternative site outside the Green Belt (whether within the urban area or elsewhere) for the proposed expansion of an HE establishment located in or adjacent to the Green Belt should be taken into account in preparing or reviewing a development plan. Green Belt boundaries should be altered only in exceptional circumstances, after consideration of development opportunities within urban areas. Local planning authorities will wish to take an early opportunity to consult HFE establishments in or adjacent to the Green Belt about their development intentions. Plan preparation procedures provide opportunities for full public consultation on proposals to alter boundaries.”

PPS3 (2006): Housing

PPS3 provides advice on meeting the housing requirements of the whole community, and reducing car dependence by facilitating more walking and cycling, and by improving public transport linkages between different uses. Part of the guidance requires local authorities to undertake strategic housing market assessments which must examine the need and demand for particular types of housing in their area. Explicit reference is made (in Annex C) to the need to accommodate the requirements of students.

PPS6 (2006): Planning for Town Centres

PPS6 does not identify educational uses per se as main town centre uses which should be directed towards central locations following the application of the sequential approach. Individual uses such as arts/cultural facilities, conference centres and indoor sports could be regarded as town centre uses, although PPS6 recognises that operators may have a business model which precludes town centre locations.

PPS7 (2004): Sustainable Development in Rural Areas

PPS7 reiterates the guidance in PPS1 which notes that decisions should be based on sustainable principles. Priority should be given to the re-use of previously developed land, and all development in rural areas should be well designed, in keeping and scale with its location, and sensitive to the character of the countryside and local distinctiveness.

The guidance emphasises the need for rural areas to provide for high and stable levels of
economic growth and employment and to ensure that the location of new development is accessible and well related to centres. It seeks to ensure that the quality and character of the wider countryside is protected and where possible enhanced, and that development should take account of the need to protect natural resources and conserve specific features and designated sites of landscape, wildlife or historic importance.

4.66 Paragraph 28 advises that best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a) should be taken into account alongside other sustainability considerations when determining planning applications or allocating land for development, noting that where significant development of agricultural land is unavoidable, planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land (Grades 3b, 4 and 5) in preference to that of higher quality, except where this would be inconsistent with other sustainability considerations.

PPS9 (2005): Biodiversity and Geological Conservation

4.67 PPS9 gives general advice on development affecting designated sites. It notes that planning authorities should not refuse permission if development can be subject to conditions that will prevent damaging impacts on wildlife habitats or important physical features, or if other material factors are sufficient to override nature conservation considerations.

PPG13 (2001): Transport

4.68 PPG13 gives advice on the integration of planning and transport policy in order to promote more sustainable transport choices; accessibility to jobs, shopping, leisure facilities and services by public transport, walking and cycling; and reducing the need to travel, especially by car.

4.69 Paragraph 38 in particular states:

“HE and FE establishments are major generators of travel and should be located so as to maximise their accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling. Similarly, proposals to develop, expand or redevelop existing sites should improve access by public transport, walking and cycling.”

PPG15 (1994): Planning and Historic Environment

4.70 PPG15 explains the role of the planning system in protecting historic buildings, conservation areas and other elements of the historic environment. Local planning authorities have a statutory duty to consider the desirability of preserving or enhancing the character or appearance of a conservation area when considering development
proposals in, or adjacent to a conservation area. Duties also exist to consider the impact of development proposals on the character or setting of listed buildings.

PPG16 (1990): Archaeology and Planning

4.71 PPG16 states that archaeological remains should be seen as a finite and non-renewable resource and appropriate management is essential to ensure that they survive in good condition. Where nationally important archaeological remains are affected by proposed development, there should be a presumption in favour of their physical preservation.

4.72 Developers and local authorities are urged to take into account archaeological considerations and deal with them from the beginning of the development control process. The guidance stresses that the case for the preservation of archaeological remains must be assessed on the individual merits of each case.

PPG17 (2002): Open Space, Sport and Recreation

4.73 PPG17 recognises the benefits of open space, sport and recreation in promoting social inclusion, community cohesion and healthy living. The guidance requires an assessment of the needs of a local area and the identification of any quantitative or qualitative deficiencies or surpluses.

PPS23 (2004): Pollution Control

4.74 PPS23 states that decision-makers must be satisfied that planning permission can be granted on land use grounds taking full account of the environmental impacts. This requires close cooperation with the Environment Agency and other relevant bodies such as water and sewerage agencies to ensure that any potential form of pollution can be adequately regulated.

PPG24 (1994): Planning and Noise

4.75 PPG24 seeks to locate new development involving noisy activities away from noise-sensitive land uses. It introduces the concept of Noise Exposure Categories (NECs) to help local planning authorities in their consideration of applications for residential development near transport-related noise sources. However the guidance notes that 'the planning system should not place unjustifiable obstacles in the way of such development'. The guidance provides a list of means that could control the source of, or limit exposure to, noise.


4.76 PPS25 emphasises that flood risk should be considered alongside other spatial planning
issues in the determination of planning applications and sets out a sequential approach to site selection with preference given to those sites which are least susceptible to flooding. A Flood Risk Assessment will need to accompany any proposal which relates to land over 1 hectare in size. This must identify and assess all forms of flood risk and demonstrate that any risk (both to and from the development) will be managed and also identify opportunities to reduce the probability and consequences of flooding.

Other Planning Considerations

4.77 Alongside current planning policy, there is further systematic review underway, prompted by the Barker Review of Land Use Planning and culminating in the recent publication of the White Paper Planning for a Sustainable Future.

Barker Review of Land Use Planning

4.78 The Interim Report of July 2006 looked specifically at the growth of universities and recognised their importance for economic development. Barker noted that the HE sector is undergoing major expansion with over £4bn of new construction orders in the school and university sector in 2004, second only to office development. The UK HE estate comprised almost 35m square metres of gross space in 2004, with a total insurance replacement value of £38.9 billion. Meeting the Government’s target of 50 per cent of young people receiving higher education by 2010, from 43 per cent in 2003/04, will mean significant further expansion to accommodate anticipated growth, while existing buildings will also require modernisation.

4.79 Barker recognised that the HE sector in England is extremely diverse, and the extent to which the land use planning system acts as a facilitator or impediment to development varies in nature and extent from institution to institution. However, as the Association of University Directors of Estates (AUDE) has pointed out:

‘The experience of HE institutions in terms of the planning system is varied. Most will have developed estate strategies and, in doing so, will have engaged with the planning authorities. In best-case scenarios the university strategy is formally endorsed by planning authorities and incorporated in relevant plans. At the opposite end of the spectrum, there may be informal agreement at a strategic level, but then individual planning applications are frustrated by the process and by changed local policies.’

4.80 The greatest challenges arise when universities are seeking major expansion and Barker recognised these are inevitably problematic particularly if this involves using land
designated as Green Belt. The University of Bath is cited as a case study where 14 hectares has been removed from the Green Belt to prevent the decline of the university, but it took nearly four years of intense lobbying and effort from the university and a substantial commitment in consultancy costs to achieve this result. The university still cannot secure enough land in Bath for larger scale expansion and is committed to developing in Swindon.

4.81 The University of Surrey also recently managed to convert its extant 1965 planning permission to a more secure outline planning permission. This has secured its future and provided it with a framework to be able to respond to new opportunities. However to achieve this through the Local Plan route took six years and incurred substantial financial costs of £500,000 (not including the S106 obligations which have yet to be decided or staff time).

4.82 The University of York was also cited by Barker, where the current campus is constrained by a condition restricting development density to 20% and it is now almost at full capacity. A proposed new campus at Heslington East was one of 16 sites considered for University expansion and the City of York Draft Local Plan proposed to allocate the site. The abandonment of the Local Plan resulted in the University submitting an outline planning application and, post-Barker, this has recently been approved by the Secretary of State, three years after the application was submitted. This is a seminal decision and is considered in more detail in section 5.

Planning White Paper

4.83 A White Paper on reforming the planning system, “Planning for a Sustainable Future”, was published in May 2007. It remains to be seen the extent to which the proposals will be taken forward into legislation, but nevertheless the document carries some weight. The White Paper recommends the introduction of national policy statements to be prepared for nationally significant infrastructure and the creation of an independent commission to take decisions. It also proposes a long overdue revised PPS4: ‘Planning for Economic Development’ (expected in Summer 2007) and changes to LDF procedures to ensure a more streamlined and tailored process with greater flexibility.

4.84 The White Paper supports positive planning for sustainable economic development in plan making and decision making, with a revised statement of General Principles requiring authorities to pay full regard to economic, as well as environmental and social benefits of development.

4.85 In particular, the White Paper advocates a more strategic approach to economic development. For instance, Core Strategies should set out the circumstances in which they would accept development not envisaged when the plan was approved. The White
Paper identifies a specific example of such circumstances as being “...if a proposal addressed a particular skills need.” (para 7.47, page 114). It argues that this would result in fewer Departures, fewer Referrals to the Secretary of State, and result in quicker decisions. In plan making, it recommends that local authorities need to respond to new forms of economic development, such as providing for clusters and innovation, in enabling an area to fulfil its economic potential.

4.86 In decision making, a new approach to the determination of planning applications that do not have specific development plan support but which are supported by market information and economic information is advocated. Full account should be taken of the long term benefits of development that will create jobs, including wider benefits to national, regional or local economies by improving productivity and competitiveness.

4.87 The White Paper does not propose a review of Green Belt. The national policy remains unchanged and no wholesale review of boundaries is proposed, and it reaffirms support for continued protection of green spaces as being important to shaping urban form.
5. Green Belt Justification

5.1 Any development for university purposes, other than for those essentially outdoor uses specified in PPG2, is “inappropriate development” within the Green Belt. This is by definition harmful to the Green Belt, and it is necessary to demonstrate that there are “very special circumstances” to outweigh that harm if planning permission is to be granted.

5.2 This is the principal planning consideration for the application and the most critical as about half of the University’s future growth depends on development in the Green Belt.

5.3 A further factor which has only recently emerged is the Warwick District Local Plan Review Inspector’s support for the Major Developed Site designation and his view that the broader definition of an MDS in this context is appropriate given the regional policy support for universities in Policy PA4 of the WMRSS and the existence of the ‘commitments’ in the University Development Plan SPG which he regards as a material consideration.

5.4 Clearly, the Inspector’s Report has yet to be fully digested by Warwick District Council and is not yet adopted policy but some weight can be afforded to his conclusions. Policy SSP2 of course allows infill and redevelopment but, as the University does not propose any redevelopment on the Warwickshire Land, the relevant criteria for infill are those in PPG2 Annex C which state that infilling should:

- Have no greater impact on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt than the existing development
- Not exceed the height of the existing buildings
- Not lead to a major increase in the developed proportion of the site.

5.5 Given the proposal is to site a further 81,900 sq m in the Green Belt, almost as much again as the existing built estate on the Warwickshire land (93,229 sq m), it is difficult to see how these criteria could be met unless the Inspector’s view of the SPG ‘commitments’ is taken at face value. Even then, the current proposals reflect a thorough review of the 1994 University Development Plan and it is considered that what is now proposed will create much more vibrant and inclusive campus.

5.6 The University has therefore concentrated on demonstrating the existence of very special circumstances (VSCs) to justify the development in Green Belt, although it is open to the local planning authorities to take into account the Inspector recommended MDS designation. These VSCs are as follows:
i) The historic acceptance of university development in this location
ii) The lack of alternative sites outside the Green Belt
iii) The sustainability (i.e. transport reduction benefits) of single campus development
iv) The strategic policy support for university expansion
v) The economic benefits of university growth
vi) The limitations of the development plan process in facilitating continued expansion.

5.7 The first three reflect the very special circumstances previously used by the University and accepted by the local planning authority and GOWM in approving other developments on the Warwickshire Land. These are also cited in the University Development Plan SPG, along with the grant of outline planning permission in 1964, which we subsume within the historical acceptance VSC.

5.8 The remainder of this section addresses these VSCs in turn.

VSC1: Historic Acceptance of University Development

5.9 The University was established in 1964 as part of the then Government’s plans to expand higher education. Other ‘Robbins’ universities formed at this time include York, Sussex, East Anglia and Lancaster. All were located on the edge of built up areas to allow expansive single campus development.

5.10 The Warwick site was gifted for the purpose of establishing a university by the local authorities of Coventry and Warwickshire, at which time the Warwickshire Land was already (and had been since 1960) in the West Midlands Green Belt. This was not inconsistent with Government policy of the time which allowed "institutions standing in extensive grounds" to be developed and extended in Green Belt.

5.11 The Outline Planning Permissions granted by both the City of Coventry Council (ref: 19410) and Warwick Rural District Council (ref: 63/5077) in 1964 approved the development of land on either side of Gibbet Hill Road for university purposes and required the submission of an overall development plan to define details of layout, car parking, landscaping and programming of all new building. The reasons given were to ensure a high standard of layout and design, satisfactory traffic flow, economic provision of services and release of land of high agricultural value only when required for development. In respect of the latter, it was indicated that the Warwickshire Green Belt land would not be required until at least 1970.

5.12 This condition led to the submission and subsequent approval of the first University
Development Plan in 1964, updated in 1965 and then again in 1966. These made provision for a 417 acre campus, accommodating 15,000 rising eventually to 20,000 students, including residential accommodation for over two thirds of this population. The plans incorporated proposals for a major dual carriageway (the “Valley Route”) to the south-east of the University, extensive underground car parking and high rise hill top buildings of up to 14-storeys (including in the Green Belt).

5.13 Since 1964, many applications have been submitted for university development to both Coventry and Warwick Councils. In addition, University Development Plans were approved in 1974 and 1994, the latter of which was approved by both Councils as Supplementary Planning Guidance (SPG) in 1995. It is this document which has been used most recently as the basis against which proposals for new development have been considered.

5.14 Reference to the planning history of the university confirms that, up until 1972, the majority of new development was focused on what is now Central Campus East and Gibbet Hill. The first development in the Green Belt was approved in July 1972 and provided for residential accommodation for 600 students at Cryfield. Further development in the Green Belt occurred through the 1980s onwards including the post-experience centres of Radcliffe House and Scarman House, the Business School and the Sports Pavilion.

5.15 The presence today of the Lakeside Residences (including Heronbank) as well as a loop road which links the two roundabouts on Gibbet Hill Road (all built within the last decade) reflect the proposals in the 1994 Development Plan. Indeed, where applications affecting land within the Green Belt have been in compliance with this Development Plan and policy DW EMP8 of the adopted Warwick District Local Plan, they have been approved in principle before referral to the Secretary of State. In all cases, there has been no intervention and permission has been granted.

5.16 One example is the approval of student residences comprising 700 bedrooms and 50 flats as a southern extension of the Lakeside development. The Warwick Planning Committee Report dated 11 September 2002 refers to the lack of suitable sites both within the confines of the existing campus (i.e. on the Coventry side) and elsewhere outside the Green Belt. It also notes the reduction in the need to travel by providing accommodation on campus. The Officers’ Report concluded:

“….I consider that given the inclusion of this site within the University Development Plan, the matters contained in the applicant’s statement of support constitute very special circumstances to justify this proposal”.

TURLEY ASSOCIATES
5.17 The 1994 Development Plan refers at paragraph 1.4.7 to the weight to be attached to the “historical and locational reasons for continued development and expansion” of the University. This led to the identification of four factors which amount to very special circumstances:

- The historic acceptance of long term development for University purposes in this area;
- The grant of outline planning permission during the 1960s;
- The lack of suitable alternative sites for University expansion beyond the Green Belt; and
- The transport reduction benefits that arise from campus development rather than disaggregated development.

5.18 Whilst the current proposals represent a shift of emphasis from the 1994 Plan, it is important to stress that the development areas identified as of 2007 are substantially the same as those identified in 1994. It is not the intention of the University to expand physically beyond its historic boundaries and, therefore, the next 10 years of growth can be accommodated without incursion into areas not previously developed or ‘committed’ for development.

5.19 It would in fact be perverse to stop university development in its tracks because of a change in national policy which was never intended to prevent the legitimate expansion plans of major UK universities. This is addressed later in VSC6.

VSC2: The Lack of Reasonable Alternative Sites outside Green Belt

5.20 Para C16 of PPG2 addresses the specific circumstances of an HE establishment expanding in or adjacent to Green Belt, referring to the development plan process taking into account the “lack of a reasonable alternative site outside the Green Belt (whether within the urban area or elsewhere)”. 

5.21 This was considered in the comparable University of York Green Belt decision (APP/C2741/V/05/1189972) where the Secretary of State agreed with her Inspector (letter dated 24 May 2007) that the very special circumstances put forward by the University in that case could only be accepted if there were no suitable alternative means of accommodating the proposed development on land not located in the Green Belt.

5.22 This is therefore a critical issue for the University of Warwick, but there are important differences between their circumstances and those of York. In York’s case, the decision was taken to establish a new and separate campus east of the main campus at
Heslington, albeit with strong connections to the existing site. The site was open countryside in agricultural use. There were therefore real locational choices to be made.

5.23 By contrast, Warwick is proposing to continue development of its established campus, building on earlier development plan concepts which most recently (after 1994) led to the construction of the loop road around Central Campus West, which links the various developments on the Warwickshire land. This represents a ‘built form’ (not to mention the significant investment in infrastructure) providing a series of spatial reference points for future development. There is therefore a much clearer and historic rationale for development in the Warwickshire Green Belt (as set out in VSC1).

5.24 To develop an alternative site outside the Green Belt at this stage would mean abandoning forty years of campus planning. This does not appear to the University to be what PPG2 or Government policy in its broadest sense intended.

5.25 An exercise has nevertheless been carried out to consider what might constitute a reasonable alternative site outside the Green Belt, and whether one exists which could accommodate the University’s proposed development.

5.26 The first stage of the exercise was conducted within the context of the EIA in considering alternatives to the proposed development. The University’s consultant team generated a range of alternative scenarios for testing the masterplan as follows:

(a) The “zero-growth” option
(b) Limited growth, assuming development only on non-Green Belt land (i.e. on the Coventry side of the campus)
(c) Full growth, but at much higher densities on non-Green Belt land
(d) Full growth on non-Green Belt sites – the concept of a “satellite campus”
(e) Full growth taking up no further Green Belt through non-site specific expansion – the concept of the Warwick “brand” being used to badge research and teaching activity elsewhere in the area, region or indeed worldwide

SCENARIO A – ZERO GROWTH

5.27 During the public consultation exercises undertaken by the University over the past 2 years, the question has been asked as to why Warwick needs to grow given its existing success. Growth however is not an aim in its own right but, as a means to an end, is essential in achieving the University’s vision of becoming a universally acknowledged world centre of higher education by 2015. Research activity in particular must grow if Warwick is to challenge the much larger and more powerful research-based universities on the world stage. The effect of zero growth would in fact be to decline and fall behind
even UK competition from other fast-growing universities. This is simply not an option for Warwick, which has been one of the UK’s most entrepreneurial universities of the last 40 years.

SCENARIO B – LIMITED GROWTH CONTAINED WITHIN NON-GREEN BELT LAND

5.28 An assessment has been made of the development capacity of the University campus at Coventry by identifying appropriate sites and assessing the approximate size of the buildings that could be accommodated on each site. This involved an assessment of indicative building footprints and heights in the context of existing buildings and landscape – including consideration of the Green Belt setting where relevant. In calculating development area, allowance has been made for new landscape, roads and paths and parking. On the basis of this assessment, the capacity of the non-Green Belt campus, including Westwood and Gibbet Hill, is 89,200 sq m GEA (Gross External Area).

5.29 This is less than half of the University’s anticipated requirements for the next 10 years. It is difficult to predict the consequences of such a constraint on physical growth, particularly as the opportunities for development on the Coventry land are relatively modest and dispersed, so, as the campus fills up, significant new buildings or clusters of activity would be less capable of being accommodated where they are best located.

5.30 A constrained campus would not offer the flexibility or match the level of ambition that Warwick desires and, therefore, “limited growth” also operates a brake on the potential of the University to achieve its goals.

SCENARIO C – FULL GROWTH BUT AT HIGHER DENSITY

5.31 As stated above, the capacity of the non-Green Belt campus is 89,200 sq m GEA at existing campus densities (a plot ratio of 0.5-0.7) based on buildings of around 3-5 storeys. Because this assessment was made taking into account roads, paths, landscaping and parking requirements, it follows that the only way to achieve higher densities is to increase the number of storey heights of each development. In addition, it would be necessary to provide the car parking associated with additional floorspace within non-Green Belt areas close to the developments. Our investigations have shown that an additional multi-storey car park would be required to accommodate this requirement. This would occupy a site otherwise available for development.

5.32 Taking these factors into account it is reasonable to suggest that doubling the proposed number of storeys of developments on non-Green Belt land would fulfil the University’s requirements. It is felt that this would be extremely detrimental to the existing campus; the open spaces and parkland landscape are highly regarded assets of the campus and
would be spoiled by overdevelopment.

5.33 The Masterplan explores what would happen if accommodating all development on non-Green Belt land, and shows the mismatch in scale between existing and proposed developments, which would confine and overshadow proposed public spaces.

5.34 Full development on non-Green-Belt land cannot be accommodated at heights appropriate to the surrounding buildings and landscape unless the parameters set out above regarding retaining landscape are disregarded, car parking is located either underneath or remote from the developments and infrastructure is squeezed to maximise development plots. This would mean developing virtually every piece of greenspace on the Coventry land, and creating a very “urban” campus. However, it is the “green” campus which lends the University its distinct character and helped it to be voted the best in the UK in a 2005 student poll published by the THES. This is recognised in the University’s vision. Development of these cherished areas would produce the characteristics of a City Centre institution; entirely inappropriate for a campus on the edge of a city and fringed by countryside.

5.35 To achieve the University’s development aims, the density of the Library Road area would have to be applied throughout the campus, resulting in a monotonous feel, contrary to the structuring strategies and spatial hierarchies of a dense, vibrant academic hub circled by quieter peri-urban residential ‘villages’. These strategies promoted in the current and previous masterplan iterations help to integrate the built environment into its rural setting.

5.36 A central aspiration of the masterplan is to provide high quality public realm with landscaped squares and routes to engender interaction and synthesis between academics, researchers and students. Just as in any urban design framework, the plazas and squares form hubs for social interaction and are of huge importance to the university. The squeezing of infrastructure and maximising of built development plots would either preclude or significantly reduce the quality and success of these spaces.

5.37 Infilling every available area will inhibit the flexibility of existing and new departmental buildings to expand, as adjacent plots may be taken up by potentially unrelated activities (as opposed to those with better synergies). Major new developments, such as new departments, require larger sites for unified facilities. A strategy whereby the majority of new development takes place on infill sites across the existing campus is inappropriate for this and may even deter the establishment of major new academic ventures at Warwick.

5.38 Higher densities could also be achieved by extra storeys on existing buildings which would help preserve existing open land around the campus. However, as the buildings
on campus were not originally designed to accommodate vertical extensions, the works would require extensive structural works within existing buildings, making this form of expansion hugely inefficient and unsustainable. The servicing of the buildings (e.g. plant/lifts etc) would need to be overhauled. Disruption to University activities during such expansion would be considerable. In some building types, such as laboratories, this would be near impossible in cost terms. Any extensions to existing buildings would also require that the entire structure be made compliant with new Part L Building Regulations.

5.39 Most of the lower-rise buildings on the campus have pitched roofs, making any proposals for vertical expansion yet more inefficient and complex. Flat roofed buildings (predominantly from the 1960s and located around Library Road) are, in principle, better suited to accommodate vertical expansion, but are in some cases already 5 storeys or more and further height to their elevations could compromise the quality of the campus, leading to an even more urban feel to Library Road. The lower-rise residential buildings around the estate perimeter were designed as small suburban-style communities within the landscape, and as such it would not be appropriate to increase the scale of the existing buildings.

5.40 Most buildings are fit-for-purpose and there is little obsolescence to generate significant redevelopment opportunities across campus. Therefore, wholly new development on virgin sites is the only form of physical expansion available to the University.

5.41 For these reasons, the University does not believe that its full anticipated growth over the next 10 years could be accommodated within the non-Green Belt campus.

5.42 This was accepted in the York case where the Inspector concluded at IR652 that higher density development would “significantly harm the character and appearance of the area”, whilst retaining the existing density would be “important in terms of maintaining the attractive character of the campus” (IR653). The same principles apply to Warwick.

**SCENARIO D – FULL GROWTH BASED ON A SATELLITE CAMPUS**

5.43 If it is assumed that the existing non-Green Belt campus can accommodate no more than 89,200 sq m GEA, the balance of the University’s floorspace requirement over the next 10 years would require a site of between 12-17 hectares at current campus plot ratios of between 0.5-0.7 (based on the existing density of development). However, adopting a plot ratio of around 0.8-1.2, suitable for a City Centre location, then the land requirement would be somewhere between 6.6 and 10 hectares.

5.44 This higher plot ratio is dependent on buildings of 5 or more storeys, a scale of development which few University buildings can actually warrant. Recent Warwick
developments such as the Digital Lab and the potential extension of the existing Medical School illustrate how development requirements tend to come in smaller chunks. New residential accommodation and major new departments (such as the possible new Medical School) are the only sort of development requirements for which such a scale of building is appropriate. A City Centre campus would therefore present a different kind of constraint in failing to afford the flexibility to respond to development requirements in the way which Warwick’s existing campus can.

5.45 The establishment of a satellite campus would need to provide a critical mass of support facilities to avoid staff and students needing to travel back and forth from main campus. This is an issue even for outlying parts of main campus where the masterplan envisages new nodes or hubs where social space and catering services can be provided. There is of course already the Warwick HRI facility at Wellesbourne in south Warwickshire (a relatively recent acquisition of a bespoke self-contained horticultural research institute) where the separation from main campus is experienced and integration with the wider university community is more of a challenge.

5.46 It is inconceivable that the University would countenance multiple satellite operations around Coventry and Warwickshire; and this is a stance supported by the York Inspector at IR660:

“I accept that there are very successful universities in this country which are not located on a single campus. However, they have developed in that way for historic reasons. York was conceived as a campus university and that business model has proved successful……. I am satisfied that the campus model should be maintained. I do not consider that different elements of the proposed development should be regarded as separate entities that can readily be disaggregated.”

5.47 We have therefore only considered the prospects for a single satellite campus of between 6.6ha for a City Centre location and 17ha for a more suburban location. The area of search has also been restricted to the City of Coventry and Warwick District, given the University’s location on the boundary of the two authorities, and sites close to the borders in adjoining authorities such as Rugby or Solihull. A comparable exercise for the University of York adopted a search area of 30km from the existing campus, but York is a more isolated location. Warwick is less than 30km from Birmingham and it would be inappropriate to consider locations closer to other major universities for a satellite campus. The sites are shown on the plans in Appendix 3.

**REVIEW OF ALTERNATIVE SITES**

5.48 The **Swanswell Initiative** is a major inner urban masterplan for a swathe of land north-east of the City Centre, extending to some 60ha. Proposals include a ‘Learning Quarter’
focussed on relocating the City FE College and redeveloping Sidney Stringer School. Other proposals include extension of the Phoenix Initiative around the Motor Museum, new offices around Bishop Street, redevelopment of the Council Depot on Foleshill Road for a mix of uses to complement the recent Electric Wharf residential scheme, and a Mental Health facility on the former hospital site. The draft masterplan does not envisage further educational uses on the scale required to facilitate a satellite campus for the University of Warwick. The masterplan is not yet adopted as SPD but the momentum built up around the existing proposals – the Council has recently agreed to remove Junction 2 of the Ring Road to kickstart the next stage – suggests that a radical amendment to introduce even more educational uses at the expense of the wider mix envisaged would not be welcome, nor appropriate for this vital regeneration project.

5.49 **Friargate** is an 8ha (279,000 sq m) mixed use development proposal adjoining Coventry Railway Station. It will include Grade A offices, leisure, restaurant and residential uses, making the most of the location at this key transport node. It is a key project in the transformation of Coventry (targeting Lyons Review Government office relocations) and its impact would be diminished if three-quarters of the site was given over to a university campus (albeit with an urban grain which would be necessary in this location). An application has yet to be approved in any event for the development.

5.50 Of Coventry’s Sub-Regional Employment Sites, only **Jaguar Whitley** (32ha) is of sufficient size to accommodate a satellite campus, and is located on the southern edge of the city at the junction of the A45/A46. However, this has planning permission for a mixed use business park to complement the existing Jaguar Research facility at this site (and indeed was taken out of the Green Belt through the UDP for this purpose). It is also a commercial enterprise and the release of over half the site to the University for educational uses, in addition to research, would undermine the project rationale and diminish the supply of high quality employment sites for the city.

5.51 The other Jaguar site at **Browns Lane**, to the west of the city, is reserved in the UDP for expansion by the car-maker but as recently as March 2007, Ford sold the 40ha site to developer Macquarie Goodman for an office and warehousing park, with the Jaguar wood veneering facility being retained on 17ha. As a key employment site with a history of special protection, the site has never been considered as an alternative location for a university campus and would conflict with the current developer’s commercially driven aspirations.

5.52 Elsewhere, **Paragon Park** is a site currently being promoted on a former brickworks off Stoney Stanton Road in the north of the city. At 23ha overall, the development aims are to provide 8.5ha of housing fronting the canal and Webster’s Park for around 450 houses, 4.5ha of mixed uses around a ‘village core’ including B1 uses, c500 apartments,
live/work units and other employment generating uses, 4ha of open space and around
6ha of employment uses adjacent to Foleshill Road containing not less than 25,000 sq.m
of floorspace. This scheme has outline planning permission. This site is in a deprived area
and is a residential-led mixed-use scheme with no scope for introducing a university
campus. Also, relocation of the existing metal recycling plant is proving difficult so timing
is uncertain.

5.53 To the west of the city, another former industrial site is in the process of being
redeveloped. Bannerbrook Park is the former Agco/Massey Ferguson plant and, as well as
a residential component, there is planning permission for a 14ha science park. Again, the
mix of uses is commercially driven to facilitate the site’s redevelopment and the
relocation of the Agco HQ offices to Stoneleigh Park in Warwickshire. A university campus
would diminish the already short supply of such employment sites within Coventry.

5.54 Another former industrial site in the course of redevelopment is the Peugeot Stoke Works,
where residential redevelopment is the chosen route although approximately 7.4ha is
available for employment uses, including retained Peugeot HQ operations. The site is
therefore not large enough to accommodate a university campus, given its suburban
location.

5.55 Peugeot’s other site, the Ryton Works in Rugby District, has recently been sold to
Trenport Developments, a London-based developer, for predominantly warehousing use.
At over 50ha, it is a substantial brownfield Green Belt site but the preference of all parties
appears to have been that it remains in employment use, for which it is designated in the
Rugby Local Plan.

5.56 On the NE edge of the city, in Rugby Borough is the Ansty site of 40ha. This is owned by
AWM, the regional development agency and has no current occupier. It is designated as
a Major Investment Site in the WMRSS for a single inward investor. The University has
been in discussion with AWM, the City Council and the Walsgrave Hospital Trust to
support development of a Medical Technology Park at variance with its current planning
status (although this is likely to change through the review of the RSS). AWM are in
advanced discussions with two parties for development which would be broadly
consistent with its MIS designation and there remains a desire to pursue development of
at least part of the site for a Medical Technology Park, in which the University may
participate. The site is therefore not appropriate for a satellite campus, even though it is
one of the few sites large enough and in public ownership.

5.57 Of the sites in Warwick District, Tournament Fields (20ha) is being developed as a major
office park and its development for a university campus would undermine the supply of
high quality employment sites in the district.
5.58 There are then only the Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt (Policy SSP2) which are of sufficient size to accommodate the university’s requirements. As these are no different in status from the University campus, these are not considered suitable alternatives. They include Stoneleigh Park (the Royal Agricultural Society HQ) which is 91ha and development will only be permitted in line with policy SSP3 for land uses related only to agricultural activities, equestrianism and the well-being of the countryside and its inhabitants; Stoneleigh Business Park, a 21 ha office park in a woodland setting which has been progressively redeveloped and offers no opportunity for university use; and the former Honiley Airfield, which at 13ha is too small but has recently been approved as a research and testing facility for Formula One company ProDrive (on the basis of overriding economic need).

5.59 There are therefore a number of sites which are of sufficient size to accommodate a satellite university campus, but none that are capable of providing a suitable alternative to the proposed campus expansion either by virtue of alternative commercial proposals being advanced, preferred or otherwise committed in planning terms.

5.60 There also remain strong arguments against a satellite campus in any event which include:

- Transport infrastructure would need to be set up between the new campuses. This obviously has implications on the sustainability of the development.
- A single campus will foster synergy and interaction between departments more successfully.
- Two smaller campuses may not provide the critical mass to support social facilities which might be accommodated in a single campus.
- The decanting of departments to a new site might prove difficult, especially for those departments who are first to inhabit the new site and as such are isolated from the University for the first years of the development.
- The management of a University across two campuses would inevitably be more complex and costly.

SCENARIO E – FULL GROWTH BASED ON EXPORTING THE WARWICK “BRAND”

5.61 Finally, there is no doubt that the Warwick “brand” is capable of being exported to “badge” indigenous, joint venture or franchise activities elsewhere in the region, nationally and even internationally, as the exploration of a Warwick campus in Singapore demonstrates. The University’s aspirations are to increase its international profile in pursuit of universal recognition of its research and teaching excellence, and there is nothing in the vision that insists that Warwick’s staff or students pursue their goals only within the confines of the main campus. However, the campus and its community are
vital elements in defining Warwick’s character, and it is inconceivable that the growth of the University could be largely extrinsic. The development requirements that have been calculated assume a certain degree of “off-campus” activity and, indeed, incorporate the concept of an international quarter, where the overseas operations of other universities might congregate to further Warwick’s standing. At best, the opportunities for “brand” export are going to be one-off projects and, when combined, are unlikely to accommodate up to half the growth of the University over the next 10 years.

5.62 In conclusion, the University considers that there are no suitable alternative sites outside the Green Belt to accommodate the full growth requirements of the University over the next 10 years and therefore the masterplanned expansion of the existing campus, including the Green Belt land in Warwickshire, is the preferred option for future development of the University of Warwick.

VSC3: The Sustainability of Campus Development

5.63 One of the existing VSCs relied upon by the University of Warwick and accepted by Warwick District Council and Government Office in previous applications is the “transport reduction benefits” of a single campus as opposed to development on more than one site. This can be placed in the much wider consideration of sustainable development now enshrined in Government policy on planning.

5.64 PPS1 indicates that amongst the key components for achieving sustainable development is the need to promote mixed-uses in locations that allow the creation of linkages between different uses thereby encouraging the creation of more vibrant places. A university campus is a good example as, whilst the principal use is educational, there are a range of supporting facilities and residential accommodation that enable campus life to be sustained without generating significant travel to other destinations.

5.65 However, PPG13 identifies higher education establishments as major generators of travel which should be located to maximise their accessibility by public transport, walking and cycling. A site on the edge of the built-up area is not an intrinsically sustainable location, as noted by the York Inspector at IR707, however he recognised that in the absence of alternative sites in more sustainable locations, the “combination of uses within an extended University campus would also reduce the need to travel compared with the situation if the proposed new university facilities were to be located on a number of sites within the city”.

5.66 This set of circumstances is also true of Warwick. The matter has been explored in both the EIA and Transport Assessment accompanying the planning application. The
consideration of alternative means of accommodating the university’s development, outlined above, has concluded that to pursue a satellite campus would require a proportion of basic support services to be replicated at the satellite location but would still mean increased travel between the new site and the existing campus.

Case Study of Travel Implications of a Satellite Campus

5.67 To provide a proper basis for considering the transport implications, the University’s consultants Arup have carried out an assessment of the transport impacts of a University campus development at Ansty Park, to the north-east of Coventry – this being one of the few alternative sites even remotely capable of accommodating a campus development.

5.68 This assessment has been made on the basis that 50% of the 10 year development shown in the Masterplan occurs at Ansty. This equates to approximately 85,000 sq m of building, 900 staff and 1,375 students assuming similar proportions of academic, other, support and residential land use occurs as for development at the existing main campus.

5.69 These approximations can be used to assess the additional transport impacts arising as a result of the use of the Ansty site. Transport impacts broadly fall into three areas:

- travel to and from the workplace from home;
- travel to and from the workplace during work time for work purposes; and
- travel to and from the workplace during work time for personal purposes.

Home to Workplace Trips

5.70 The University’s 2005 Travel Survey showed the following home postcode distribution for staff/students:

- 15.7% located at Campus.
- 36.9% located in Coventry.
- 36.1% located to the south of the current campus (Kenilworth, Leamington, Warwick etc).
- 6.5% located to the west of Coventry (e.g. Birmingham).
- 4.9% located to the north and east of Coventry (e.g. Nuneaton, Rugby, Leicester etc).

5.71 The Ansty Park site is located on the north-eastern edge of Coventry directly off the A46. The A46 provides a strategic north-south route and provides a direct link between the existing Campus and the Ansty Park site. The two sites are 16km apart but the difference in distance between the points at which the two sites are accessed off the A46 is
approximately 10 km.

5.72 When compared to the impact of development at Campus, development at Ansty would be expected to increase travel distances by 10 km for 46.9% of people travelling to the Ansty site (15.7+36.1-4.9% = 46.9%). For 43.4% of people currently located in Coventry or to the west it has been assumed that there will be no change. Therefore overall for say 45% of staff/students travelling to Ansty there is likely to be an increase of 20kms travelled. This is a robust assessment given that the disposition of people living in Coventry has a bias to the south and nearer to the Campus. Over time there may be a tendency for staff to locate closer to the Ansty site.

5.73 At present, 75% of staff and 25% of students travel to Campus by car either as a driver or passenger with the majority as driver only. These percentages are likely to increase because the level of public transport provision to Ansty will not be as good as that at the Campus. The additional mileage by car will be in excess of 9,000 km/workday with consequent impacts on the environment and local road congestion.

**Work Trips during Work Time**

5.74 Based on the responses from the Travel Survey there will be the following work related trips arising from 900 staff:

- 21 trips once per month (1.05 trips per day)
- 18 trips once per week (3.6 trips per day)
- 22 trips 2-3 times per week (11 trips per day)
- 43 trips once per day.
- 53 trips per day for those travelling more than once per day.

5.75 This equates to approximately 111 trips per day of 32 km. The following factors will influence the number of trips between Campus and Ansty:

- the disposition of Departments and their locations.
- Conversion of current walking/cycling internal trips to vehicle trips.
- Consolidation of existing short vehicle trips to longer inter site trips.
- Degree to which current work trips are internal or external trips.
- Whether a shuttle bus service is provided between the two sites.

5.76 Whilst these variables are unknown it is reasonable to assume that there will be overall an increase in work related mileage of the order of 3,500 km/workday.
Personal Trips during Work Time

5.77 It has been assumed that personal trips by vehicle during work time will not be significantly impacted by the change in location. However, this is a conservative assumption because there are a number of community facilities located in or close to the current Campus which do not necessarily require a vehicle trip e.g. post office, food shopping, leisure facilities. These facilities may not be located on or close to the Ansty site thus necessitating additional vehicle trips.

Conclusions

5.78 The implications of developing a satellite campus such as Ansty are many and varied but in terms of traffic impacts it is clear that there will be significant additional vehicle mileage as a result. This will overall impact negatively on the environment and on traffic congestion on the local road network. While it is difficult at this stage to be precise about the scale of the additional mileage it is clear that it is likely to be in excess of an additional 12,500 km per workday. This, with a conservative assumption of the number of working days at 200, will give 2.5million additional vehicle km per year.

5.79 On this basis, the University believes that a single campus development is more sustainable. However, it is committed to further reducing the need to travel by car through the introduction of a Travel Plan and a proportionate reduction in the availability of car parking allied with improvements to public transport provision. The pedestrian and cycle network will also be enhanced to maximise the potential for modal shift. Increasing residential accommodation on campus, including for staff housing, will also assist in reducing the need to travel.

5.80 PPG13 sets out a number of transport planning objectives that are required to deliver sustainable development (para 6) and the University considers that it is:

- actively managing the pattern of growth to make fullest use of public transport
- ensuring that the development offers a realistic choice of access by public transport, walking, and cycling
- using parking policies, alongside other planning and transport measures, to promote sustainable transport choices and reduce reliance on the car for work and other journeys
- giving priority to people over ease of traffic movement and planning to provide more roadspace to pedestrians, cyclists and public transport
VSC4: Strategic Policy Support for University Expansion

5.81 In January 2003, the Department for Education and Skills published the White Paper "The Future of Higher Education", which set out the Government's plans for reform and investment in universities and in July 2004, the Higher Education Act was given Royal Assent.

5.82 The White Paper states that HE is a “great national asset” and “its contribution to the economic and social well-being of the nation is of vital importance" (para 1.1). It notes that the proportion of young people entering HE has increased from 6% in the early 1960s (when the University of Warwick was founded) to 43% today. It also acknowledges that universities generate £1.5m in other sectors of the economy for every £1m spent, as well as creating 89 jobs for every 100 in the universities themselves. They also assist in the start up of new companies, leading to an appreciation that universities are important regional economic drivers, enabling knowledge and skills transfer to local businesses, helping to apply new technology and training the workforce of local companies.

5.83 The White Paper identified two key challenges for the future of Higher Education:

- To widen participation across all sectors of the community
- To better harness knowledge for wealth creation – particularly in the encouragement of research and business links.

5.84 A key message in the White Paper was that “…Higher Education must expand to meet rising skill needs…” whilst in respect of research specifically, it urged that “…Government invest more in leading research departments and universities, enabling them to compete with the world’s best…”

5.85 The White Paper proposed:

“…i) To continue to expand student numbers significantly, while widening the demographic base from which students are drawn, with a targeted participation rate of 50% of 18-30 year olds in the UK;

ii) To inject substantial further into research, concentrating research capacity in institutions with a ‘critical mass’ of excellent research, in order to maintain international competitiveness; and

iii) To strengthen the relationship between Universities and businesses, fostering ‘knowledge transfer’ and encouraging close links with Regional development Agencies…”
In April 2006, the Higher Education Funding Council for England (HEFCE) produced its Strategic Plan for 2006-2011, developed in the context of Government thinking in the White Paper. HEFCE identified six core strategic aims for the HE sector:

1) Enhancing excellence in learning and teaching;
2) Widening participation and fair access;
3) Enhancing excellence in research;
4) Enhancing the contribution of HE to the economy and society;
5) Sustaining a high quality HE sector; and
6) Enabling excellence.

In particular, para 100 of the HEFCE Strategy states that “…Maintaining a dynamic, world-class research sector within HE is crucial to economic prosperity and national wellbeing…”. Para 104 continues “…Investment for the future means both sustaining the existing physical and human resource base and at the same time continuing to develop new research fields and approaches. We cannot maintain excellence unless the research base is forward looking and there are sufficient resources to pursue new ideas…”.

The strategy sets out that there is a need, as a nation, to improve productivity and management of innovation, particularly in the existing workforce. The strategy comments that the Government’s framework for science and innovation highlights the role that the HE knowledge base can and will play as a source of the country’s global competitiveness and for creating ideas, as well as entrepreneurs and enhancing skills, management capability and productivity.

Para 119 states that “…HE campuses themselves, their staff and students, are microcosms of this diversity…” whilst para 120 comments that “…Institutions already support the economy and communities in a multitude of ways. But to help them fulfill these roles more effectively, we need to support them in engaging with the users of knowledge and skills, as a ‘third stream’ of activity alongside and integrated with teaching and research…”.

The strategy points out that sustaining the HE sector’s high standing globally, as well as its major national, regional and local contribution is vitally important. It acknowledges that this is a significant challenge at a time when other countries are investing more in their HE systems and when the needs of students, employers and others are changing and becoming more demanding.

Para 144 states that “…a long-term perspective is…needed to ensure that the condition of the physical infrastructure is appropriately maintained, developed and managed, and
not allowed to deteriorate as has happened in the past...”. Para 172 stipulates that the physical infrastructure of the HE sector should not rely on remedial action by Government and that “…By 2008 we (HEFCE) expect all HEI’s to be able to demonstrate that they have a strategic approach to capital planning, as part of their integrated planning processes, and to have determined where they need to invest to deliver their academic objectives....”

5.92 The University of Warwick’s vision and strategic goals are clearly aligned with this strategy and the campus masterplan is a vital component of delivering this over the period from 2008-18.

5.93 The HE sector also enjoys considerable support in the West Midlands Regional Spatial Strategy and the Regional Economic Strategy - Policies PA1, PA3 and PA4 of the RSS for example and Pillar 2 of the RES (as identified in section 4). Emerging RES policy is also strongly supportive of the role of HE in improving the skills and economic output of the region.

5.94 The key messages include a fundamental need:

- To develop skills and access to higher education and employment opportunities;
- To focus research and innovation clusters in high technology corridors, including one in Solihull, Coventry and Warwickshire;
- To facilitate the needs of higher education institutions and research facilities to grow and expand;
- To develop the research and development capabilities of higher education and the further encouragement of links with business;
- To support increased participation in higher education and to retain skilled graduates; and
- To foster partnership working between local planning authorities, relevant education and research establishments and those involved in economic development.

5.95 The University of Warwick is therefore at the forefront of regional economic development and actively involved in national and regional initiatives such as Science City, where it is active in three sectors: energy, advanced materials and translational medicine.

5.96 Finally, the development plans for both local authorities provide further strategic support for the University’s continued expansion. From 1964, when the local authorities were instrumental in the establishment of the University, they have participated in the evolution of the campus, through the positive exercise of their regulatory controls and constructive inputs to the masterplanning process. Current policy in Coventry seeks to facilitate the university’s growth and Warwick’s Local Plan Review has now been endorsed with strong support for the university’s continued growth and success.
VSC5: The Economic Benefits of University Growth

5.97 As part of the masterplan process and preparation of this application, the University commissioned work from SQW Ltd to assess the regional economic impact of the University, both at present and as a consequence of the planned growth. This is set out in detail in the Environmental Statement (Chapter 15).

5.98 The SQW study highlights the following headline statistics:

- The University generates total direct expenditure of £151m in Coventry and Warwick (the local area) and a total of £189m in the West Midlands region as a whole
- Adding indirect expenditure (generated by other businesses benefiting from the university’s presence), this amounts to an economic impact of £181m in the local area and £284m in the WM region
- The University employs over 3,000 full-time equivalent staff in the local area and over 3,800 FTE across the region
- It is estimated that further 3,800 jobs in the local area and 6,500 in the region as a whole are supported by the University
- The University produces 6,900 graduates per year of which 1,200 (17%) stay in the West Midlands for further training or employment

5.99 For comparison, the Universities UK report on The Economic Impact of UK Higher Education Institutions (May 2006) estimated the contribution of Warwick to the regional economy at £500m.

5.100 The University was hailed by the Lambert Review of Business University Collaboration in 2003 for the 1,000+ contracts for various kinds of knowledge transfer activity, including over 200 organisations in the West Midlands, with an average contract value of £0.25m. The University is also a collaborator in the Science Park which adjoins campus and has 30 hi-tech companies with a turnover in excess of £7m, and the Mercia Institute of Enterprise (which has over 5,000 students across the region).

5.101 The University’s MBA Teaching Centre and other post-experience centres provide CPD and management training for professionals and business people from around the region and beyond. The University has also recently secured Government funding for the National Institute for Learning, Skills and Innovation as well as the NHS Resource Centre for Patient and Public Involvement.

5.102 It is estimated that the expansion of the University over the next 10 years could create
between 2,600 and 3,400 additional jobs across the West Midlands (of which between 1,800 and 2,100 would be in Coventry and Warwick). This represents a 20% increase regionally and 30% locally on existing employment levels. This will also assist the continued shift in the structure of the local and regional economy away from traditional manufacturing industry towards knowledge-based activities. The University’s growth will also boost business confidence, inward investment and business tourism.

5.103 The current and potential economic benefits of the campus expansion proposals accord with one of the overarching themes of PPS1 which is the importance of promoting and delivering sustainable economic development.

**VSC6: The Limitations of the Development Plan Process in Facilitating Continued Expansion**

5.104 PPG2 Annex C makes it clear that development plans should take account of the development intentions of universities located in or adjacent to the Green Belt. As this change in policy occurred in 1995 at the same time as the adoption of the Warwick District Local Plan, its review was the first opportunity to follow this advice.

5.105 Up to this point, the University had enjoyed a favourable policy environment in both Coventry and Warwick. The development plan, however, also comprises the Warwickshire Structure Plan and its review in 2001 failed to consider any strategic alteration to the Green Belt around the south side of Coventry although it did contemplate change for instance to the north of Coventry to facilitate the redevelopment of Coventry Colliery.

5.106 When the review of the Warwick District Local Plan commenced in 2003, it was unable to ‘save’ the 1995 policy supporting university development in the Green Belt. This is recognised by the Local Plan Inquiry Inspector, whose May 2007 report notes that the District Council decided, after consultation with Government Office, to promote designation as a Major Developed Site in the Green Belt as to remove 42ha from the Green Belt would be a strategic change of such magnitude that it should properly be made by the Structure Plan or, now, the RSS.

5.107 Whilst it is the University’s intention to pursue a longer term change to the status of the Warwickshire Land through the RSS and LDF processes, this is likely to take considerable time to achieve given the current stage of the Local Plan Review, the RSS Phase 2 Review and the lack of any current proposal to undertake a strategic review of Green Belt. Furthermore, the Warwick LDF Core Strategy is anticipated by June 2010, which would be the earliest any positive change could be signalled. In terms of the University’s
expansion, this would be an unacceptable delay and extension of the uncertainty which has been present throughout the masterplanning exercise over the past 4 years.

5.108 The option of concentrating all development on the Coventry non-Green Belt land has been discussed earlier in section 5 and is in fact the University’s current short-term approach only as a result of current development initiatives being suited to Coventry sites, but this is not considered to be an acceptable or desirable medium-long term strategy.

5.109 The Inspector-endorsed MDS designation provides some comfort for the University but this was always a compromise solution and has yet to become part of adopted policy, or indeed, be fully tested against PPG2 criteria.

5.110 The development plan process is intended to ensure that suitable locations are available for a range of uses including education, so that the economy can prosper (para 23 of PPS1) and its limitations in this case create the risk that the University’s continued expansion could be frustrated. The submission of this planning application is therefore a necessary means of providing certainty, and indeed offering the most detailed and robust assessment of the University’s proposals to date.

**Compliance with Green Belt Objectives**

5.111 In addition to the demonstration of very special circumstances to justify inappropriate development in the Green Belt, PPG2 requires that any large scale development should, so far as possible, contribute to the objectives for the use of land in Green Belts, as set out at paragraph 1.6:

- to provide opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population
- to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation near urban areas
- to retain attractive landscapes, and enhance landscapes, near to where people live
- to improve damaged and derelict land around towns
- to secure nature conservation interest
- to retain land in agricultural, forestry and related uses.

5.112 The University’s proposals will improve access by both the campus community and the wider public to the surrounding open countryside through the enhancement of the footway/cycleway network with connections to external routes.

5.113 The existing rural setting of the University is undoubtedly a major asset. The high quality of the environment is regarded by the University as a significant factor in attracting staff
and students. As such the landscape strategy seeks to preserve and enhance existing features (see para 3.42).

5.114 The campus has a range of wildlife habitats within and around its boundaries and the development will provide opportunities to enhance biodiversity. The landscape around the campus which is owned by the university provides an opportunity for establishing Energy Crops for biomass energy generation.

5.115 PPG2 also states that the fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. At paragraph 5, five purposes of designating land as Green Belt are set out:

- To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another;
- To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
- To preserve the setting and historical character of historic towns; and
- To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land.

5.116 The University’s expansion will not result in unrestricted sprawl, as it will be contained within historic boundaries and on areas previously earmarked for development over the past 40 years. Furthermore, the proposed development does not extend any further south towards Kenilworth than the current extent of the campus and therefore will not lead to neighbouring towns merging.

5.117 The campus masterplan will also assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. As well as being contained within its historic boundaries, all new development sites are situated in parts of the estate which are well placed to preserve openness and minimise any impact on the quality of the wider landscape. The highest point of the site for example, adjacent to Brickyard Plantation, has been left entirely open, ensuring that any views to or from Hilltop are unaffected. With similar intentions, the majority of new development has been located in the lower parts of the site, adjacent to the existing access road and effectively screened by Whitefield Coppice.

5.118 The purpose of the Green Belt in this location is not related to any historic towns and the University contends that its expansion will not undermine efforts at urban regeneration which have been largely successful in Coventry over the recent past and there is no evidence that opportunities are being lost because of the University’s existing or anticipated future growth.
6. **Other Determining Factors**

6.1 This section considers the other planning considerations of relevance to the application, drawing from the assessment in section 4.

6.2 With regard to the development plan, the University’s proposals accord with RSS Policies PA1, PA4 and PA3 which identifies HE establishments as critical research bases in the high technology corridor of Coventry, Solihull and Warwickshire. This ties in with the Regional Economic Strategy too, which recognises the importance of the graduate workforce and, in its emerging draft, seeks to exploit knowledge assets such as universities to benefit businesses and economic performance of the region.

6.3 The proposals are consistent with Coventry UDP policy which supports the development of the University within its boundaries, and are broadly consistent with existing Warwick Local Plan policy – in its adopted form, policy is arguably inconsistent with PPG2 although historically it has supported University development. As described in section 5, the recently endorsed MDS policy in the Local Plan Review provides a new platform for promoting further development of the University. We have nevertheless sought to demonstrate very special circumstances to justify development in the Green Belt as set out in section 5.

6.4 In respect of national planning policy, the University’s proposals are consistent with PPS1 in promoting a sustainable form of development, albeit a relatively unique one. Economic, environmental and social sustainability are underpinning features of the University’s vision and overall project objectives for the campus development.

6.5 The University’s proposals are also consistent with PPS3 in providing for the needs of students to be accommodated substantially on or near campus, thereby reducing the need to travel and ensuring a vibrant community with access to a range of services.

6.6 As education is not a main town centre use listed in PPS6, the University considers it of little relevance and takes comfort from the York Inspector’s conclusions on this matter at IR691 that “the University has been successful to date by adhering to its own business model which is to concentrate all facilities together on the campus at the edge of town”. He goes on to say that it would be inappropriate for individual uses to be disaggregated for the purposes of accommodating them in town centres.

6.7 The campus expansion is consistent with PPS7 for the same reasons as development in the Green Belt can be justified with reference to very special circumstances. The landscape and visual impact assessment in the ES shows that development south of Gibbet Hill Road will further erode the openness of the countryside, although this will not
directly impact on the Arden Parklands landscape. In fact, the landscape strategy incorporates many of the management guidelines recommended for this character type. The visual impact of further development will be minimal from the majority of surrounding rural areas. The campus will be screened by Whitefields Coppice and other local woodlands and views from residential areas will be limited. From key vantage points, the new development would be viewed against a backdrop of existing University buildings. No new development would exceed the current ridgeline of the main campus. The density of development proposed would be consistent with the existing campus and will provide opportunities to raise the visual quality of the wider estate.

6.8 The University proposals take account of biodiversity and geological conservation in accordance with PPS9, as they do of the historic environment and archaeology (PPG15 and PPG16). The ES demonstrates that there are no nationally designated conservation sites in or near the campus, but several local designations and a network of wildlife corridors, which will be disrupted or affected to some degree by the proposed further development of the campus. Ecological mitigation measures will form part of the landscape strategy, such as hedgerow retention and enhancement, a wildlife-sensitive management approach and the adoption of sustainable drainage features which will increase the number of aquatic habitats on campus. The campus contains a number of sites of archaeological interest, mostly preserved by historic development, but there will need to be a watching brief particularly on the Westwood campus and Central Campus West where sub-surface disturbance is planned.

6.9 A university is a major generator of travel as PPG13 remarks, and if car parking and traffic generation were to increase by the equivalent 40% as total floorspace and staff numbers, congestion would reach unacceptable levels. In line with national and local policy, however, it is proposed to limit the increase in parking to 9% and to set a target for limiting traffic generation to 12% above existing levels.

6.10 This will be achieved through a Travel Plan to support more sustainable travel choices together with a framework for monitoring and overseeing implementation through a Transport Sub-Group comprising the local highway authorities, the Highways Agency and University.

6.11 Planning obligations (through a Section 106 Agreement) will set out highway infrastructure to be provided as part of the development together with indicative corrective measures should targets not be met. Key infrastructure improvements are likely to include:

- Cycle and pedestrian network improvements with more cycle parking, 3 signal controlled crossings of Gibbet Hill Road and modification of its layout through
Central Campus to reduce traffic speeds and improve safety

- A public transport link from Lynchgate Road for the Bus Rapid Transit from Cannon Park Shopping Centre, with a dedicated route through campus
- High quality bus shelters and stops in Central Campus with real time information, including SMS alerts to mobile phones, and direct subsidy to bus operators (including extension of the South Park & Ride)
- Closing Library Road/Gibbet Hill Road junction to vehicles other than buses, cycles and pedestrians to create a pedestrian friendly environment along Library Road
- A new roundabout at the junction of University Road (South) and Gibbet Hill Road
- Improvements to the Gibbet Hill site access and improvements to the Gibbet Hill Road/Kenilworth Road junction
- A car park management strategy will also be introduced.

6.12 These measures, if successful, will result in the critical junction at Gibbet Hill Road/Kenilworth Road performing adequately in 2018, and the road through the middle of campus will be safer whilst still catering for university and other traffic growth. The approach taken is an exemplar for sustainable development and requires a major commitment from the University, which will compliment its aim to reduce its carbon footprint.

6.13 The University proposals will also enhance opportunities for sport and recreation and therefore are consistent with PPG17.

6.14 In terms of environmental impacts (PPS23 and PPG24), the Environmental Statement addresses these comprehensively, but in summary, air quality impacts may be generated by construction dust emissions (although these can be managed), additional traffic (although pollutant levels are predicted to be within national and EU limits), and the proposed biomass CHP plant (which would generate some emissions but again within air quality objective levels). There will be no significant noise impacts arising from construction activities or road traffic, and permanent plant should not compromise the noise environment of surrounding residential areas.

6.15 Construction activities are not expected to impact on water resources, either through loss of water bodies or culverting of watercourses. The provision of sustainable drainage features may actually enhance the range of aquatic habitats. Future operation of the campus is unlikely to introduce polluting activities to threaten the water environment. A Flood Risk Assessment has also been carried out and satisfies the requirements of PPS25.

6.16 Ground conditions, which relate largely to previous agricultural activity only, suggest that there are unlikely to be any risks of contamination but suitable measures would be taken to minimise risks during future construction activities.
6.17 Finally, as a result of the forecast electricity demand arising from the masterplan proposals, a biomass CHP plant is included in the masterplan which would also supply the district heating network at the University. This would reduce energy demand and increase efficiency. Water supply and foul drainage demands can also be met with appropriate new service provision.
7. **Summary and Conclusions**

7.1 This planning statement supports an outline planning application by the University of Warwick for 171,000 sq m (GEA) of development over the next 10 years (to 2018) at its existing campus on the south-west fringes of Coventry. The application site extends to 189ha and covers all four campus areas referred to collectively as Main Campus, which are situated either side of the administrative boundary between Coventry and Warwick District.

7.2 The University has become one of Britain’s leading universities in the 40 years since it was founded and has a vision to become a universally acknowledged world centre for higher education by 2015 (its 50th anniversary), firmly in the top 50 of world universities. To achieve this requires the University to increase its international reputation, attract the highest quality staff and students, reach out to stakeholders, provide an intellectual gateway to focus regional, national and international engagement, generate a substantial increase in income, particularly through research growth, and make the Warwick campus a representation of the University’s strength of ambition and quality of imagination.

7.3 The campus is a vital element in symbolising what Warwick stands for, and the University therefore wishes to consolidate what is good about it and create a better place to live, study and work: a genuine campus community. As a socially responsible institution, Warwick also wishes to take an environmental lead by creating a “green” campus.

7.4 The Campus Masterplan is a key supporting strategy for this vision and has 8 overall objectives based around a doubling of research activity, a modest increase in student numbers (principally postgraduates), expansion of ‘third leg’ commercial activities and a proportional growth in support facilities.

7.5 The 171,000 sq m of additional development over the next 10 years will generate an additional 4000 staff and students, which is a 40% increase on today. At least 2,000 extra residential units will be provided on campus.

7.6 The masterplan seeks to promote a sense of place through reinforcing the main structure of routes, with emphasis on two key axes, and extending the network of centres of activity to promote social and academic interaction. A number of development sites have been identified, but these are contained within the 1965 boundaries of the University and do not extend building any further south towards Kenilworth than the existing sports pavilion.

7.7 The range of new buildings proposed includes the relocation of the Estates Office, an Indoor Tennis Centre at Westwood, the Digital Lab at Academic Square, further phases of
expansion at the Medical School, Business School and Maths & Stats, an Olympic-sized swimming pool, and a new social facility for Central Campus West.

7.8 The University will develop a sustainable transport strategy to ensure that the 40% increase in floorspace and people is not matched by a similar increase in traffic. A range of measures to reduce the availability of parking, encourage car sharing and other sustainable modes of transport should see only a 9% increase in parking provision and a 12% increase in traffic generation. Allied to this are improvements in the pedestrian and cycle networks around campus and improvements to public transport accessibility.

7.9 A number of off-site highway improvements are also proposed including changes to the Gibbet Hill/Kenilworth Road junction, closure of the Library Road egress to Gibbet Hill Road, a new roundabout on Gibbet Hill Road to enable two-way traffic on University Road and improvements to pedestrian crossing facilities. The University will support the Bus Rapid Transit proposal, as well as an express service to Coventry City Centre, with a new bus link from Cannon Park Shopping Centre.

7.10 This strategy will be captured in a Travel Plan and the University will appoint a co-ordinator to implement and monitor achievement of its aims and targets with the local authorities.

7.11 The landscape strategy will seek to build on the outstanding quality of the campus and protect the most sensitive features, with proposals based on the principles of sustainability. This will include consideration of biomass, with energy crops grown on adjoining University land, to provide district heating and electricity for the campus.

7.12 The application proposals broadly accord with the development plan, comprising the West Midlands RSS, Coventry UDP, Warwickshire Structure Plan and Warwick District Local Plan, which provides strategic support for the university’s expansion. However, the principal planning consideration is the need to provide very special circumstances to allow development in the Green Belt, which affects almost half of what is proposed in this application.

7.13 The Inspector’s Report on the Warwick District Local Plan Review has very recently endorsed a Major Developed Site designation for the University and this appears to offer further support to the expansion proposed, but the University has nevertheless concentrated on demonstrating that very special circumstances exist. These are:

- The historic acceptance of university development in this location since 1965
- The lack of alternative sites outside the Green Belt
- The sustainability of single campus development
• The strategic policy support for university expansion
• The economic benefits of university growth
• The limitations of the development plan process in facilitating continued expansion

7.14 The University has considered several alternative scenarios for meeting its growth requirements, but has concluded that development of its existing campus is by far the best. A satellite campus elsewhere in Coventry or Warwickshire would duplicate facilities, prevent interaction which is vital to research and innovation, result in more travel rather than less, and would make management of the University more complex and costly.

7.15 For over forty years, the University has developed in accordance with its original brief, with the support of the local authorities and in line with planning policies. The campus is a sustainable form of development and its expansion would not undermine the objectives of including the land in the Green Belt. It would in fact support the achievement of sustainable development with a range of economic, social and environmental benefits.

7.16 The University offers its proposals for endorsement by the local planning authorities, the Regional Assembly, the Regional Development Agency and ultimately the Secretary of State, and hopes for a swift decision to support its ongoing growth and expansion in pursuit of the goal of making Warwick one of the world leaders in higher education.
Appendix 1 – Location Plan
Appendix 2 – Submitted Drawings
APPROXIMATE AREAS OF NEW DEVELOPMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ZONE</th>
<th>ACREAGE</th>
<th>OTHER</th>
<th>SUPPORT</th>
<th>NURSERY/INDUSTRIAL</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3</td>
<td>2,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>2,250</td>
<td>3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A7</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A8</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>17,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>21,500</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: Map areas are approximate and do not include plots in pots.*
7.2.10 Proposed Landscape

Legend

- Agricultural Land
- Long Grass
- Short Mown Grass
- Species Rich Hedge
- Species Poor Hedge
- Existing Mature Woodland
- Juvenile Woodlands
- New Copses
- Wet Grassland
- Sports Fields
- Formal Tree Planting
- Ponds
- Drainage Ditches
- Meadow Grass
- Biomass
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Appendix 3 – Alternative Sites
Alternative Sites - Coventry

Key

1. Swanswell
2. Friargate
3. Jaguar Whitley
4. Jaguar Browns Lane
5. Paragon Park
6. Bannerbrook Park
7. Peugeot Stoke
8. Peugeot Ryton Works
9. Ansty Park
Alternative Sites - Warwick

Key:
- University of Warwick
- Tournament Fields, South West Warwick
- Stonleigh Park (RASE)
- Stoneleigh Business Park
- Honiley Airfield

Map showing locations:
- University Campus
- Tournament Fields, South West Warwick
- Stoneleigh Park (RASE)
- Stoneleigh Business Park
- Honiley Airfield