

Submission from Leyes Lane Community Group  
Version 1.0 17/03/2026

## **FORMAL REPRESENTATION FOR DISCUSSION AND CONSIDERATION**

**Site Allocation H09 – Former High School, East Kenilworth**

**Proposal: Hybrid Outline Application – 224 Dwellings + 75-Unit Extra Care (Use Class C3)**

**Planning Application: W/25/1717**

**Warwick District Local Plan 2011–2029**

### **1. INTRODUCTION AND STATUS**

This document is submitted for structured discussion with Warwick District Council officers and councillors in advance of Planning Committee determination.

The residents' position is clear:

- Existing residents do not oppose the allocation of Site H09, however consider that the proposed design requires amendment.

### **2 REQUESTED DESIGN AMENDMENTS**

Residents formally request:

1. Maximum two-storey height along all external residential boundaries.
2. Centralisation of any 3-storey elements.
3. Significant reduction in size and change to the location of Extra Care facility.
4. Density gradient plan.
5. Redistribution of eastern concentration.
6. Verified cross-sections from neighbouring gardens.
7. Reinforced landscaped perimeter buffers.
8. Retention of TPO oaks.
9. Protection of mature tree belts.
10. Realistic parking strategy.
11. Detailed surface water flooding strategy considering projections to 2050 and beyond.

This submission addresses compliance with adopted planning policy and statutory obligations, and the requirement for context-led design.

The key question is not whether development should occur, but whether the form, scale and operational impacts comply with:

- Policy DS3 – Sustainable Communities
- Policy BE1 – Layout and Design
- Policy BE3 – Amenity
- Policy TR1 – Access and Choice
- Policy HS4 – Affordable Housing
- Policy NE2 – Protecting Designated Biodiversity
- Policy NE3 – Biodiversity
- Policy FW2 – Sustainable Urban Drainage
- Policy KNP1 Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan
- NPPF (2023) Sections 11, 12, 14 and 15

### **3. USE CLASS CLARIFICATION – C3 EXTRA CARE FACILITY**

The Extra Care facility is understood to comprise:

- Self-contained flats.
- Independent front doors.
- Optional care provision.
- Communal facilities.
- Residents of 55 years old to elderly.
- Residents' staff and visitor Car Parking.
- 24-hour staffing presence.

This aligns with **Use Class C3 (Dwellinghouses)**.

This means:

- It forms part of the housing allocation.
- It is not a residential institution (C2).
- It must comply with contextual housing policies (BE1, BE3, TR1).
- Its operational characteristics (residents, staffing, visitors) must still be considered in traffic modelling.

The classification does not diminish the requirement for contextual integration.

## **4. QUANTUM AND EFFECTIVE DENSITY**

### **4.1 Allocation Context**

H09 is allocated for approximately 250 dwellings in the current Local Plan.

The proposal comprises:

- 224 dwellings.
- 75 Extra Care C3 units (self-contained flats).

While numerically within allocation range, the scheme introduces:

- A concentrated apartment-style building form.
- Potential 3-storey massing.
- Higher density elements to the east.

Kenilworth new build density trends (approx. 35–40+ dwellings per hectare) do not automatically justify urban typologies within a detached suburban edge setting.

#### **4.2 Policy Lens – DS3 & BE1**

Policy DS3 requires sustainable communities supported by infrastructure and appropriate design.

Policy BE1 requires development to respond positively to:

- Local scale.
- Massing.
- Height.
- Density.
- Natural features.

Allocation does not remove contextual design obligations.

### **5. CONSTRAINED URBAN CONTEXT – THREE-SIDED RESIDENTIAL INTERFACE**

The site is:

- Bounded on three sides by existing detached housing.
- Accessed via residential streets.
- Defined by mature trees including TPO-protected oaks.

This is a constrained suburban infill site, not edge-of-settlement expansion.

All impacts are borne directly by existing and future residents.

Under BE1 and BE3, greater sensitivity is required in such a condition.

### **6. EASTERN DENSITY CONCENTRATION**

Indications suggest greater density and flat typologies on the eastern boundary.

This creates:

- Localised overdevelopment.

- Visual imbalance.
- Increased overlooking risk.
- Height conflict with detached homes.

Policy BE1 requires a balanced layout responding to surrounding characters.

**Requested Clarification:**

- Density gradient plan (units per hectare by zone).
- Rationale for eastern concentration.
- Confirmation of step-down massing.

**7. DESIGN, BUILDING HEIGHTS, AND FIT WITH LOCALITY**

Eastern Kenilworth is characterised by:

- Two-storey detached dwellings.
- Generous plot widths.
- Mature canopy.
- Semi-rural edge identity.

Three-storey apartment-style blocks on the perimeter would introduce:

- Visual dominance.
- Material shift toward urban typology.
- Conflict with established grain.

**Policy Position**

- BE1 – Layout and Design
- BE3 – Amenity
- NPPF Para 130 – Sympathetic to local character

**Residents' Requested Amendment**

1. Maximum two-storey height along all external residential boundaries.
2. Centralisation of 3-storey elements.
3. Density gradient plan.
4. Verified cross-sections from neighbouring gardens.

**8. RESIDENTIAL AMENITY AND QUALITY OF LIFE (BE3)**

Potential impacts include:

- Overlooking.

- Overshadowing.
- Loss of privacy.
- Perception of enclosure.
- Construction disturbance (18–24 months).

Minimum separation standards do not automatically ensure BE3 compliance.

Requested evidence:

- BRE daylight/sunlight study.
- Privacy impact analysis.
- Construction Environmental Management Plan.

## **9. HIGHWAYS AND ACCESS (TR1)**

The development proposes two access points feeding a single internal road.

Existing surrounding roads experience:

- Commuter congestion.
- Schools peak congestion.
- Access to bus stops.
- Access to shops and public house.

Parking provision is understood to include:

- Single space allocations for many dwellings.

This creates foreseeable overspill risk.

Extra Care C3 scheme includes:

- Residents' parking.
- 24-hour staffing.
- Visitor parking.
- Health services visits.

TR1 requires safe and suitable access.

Requested evidence:

1. Parking stress survey for the whole site (400m radius) due to proximity of Kenilworth school and potential overflow parking from utilisation of free shops and pub car park.
2. Staff parking plan for Extra Care.
3. Cumulative peak-hour modelling.
4. Emergency vehicle swept path analysis.

5. Construction Traffic Management Plan.

## **10. DEMOLITION OF EXISTING HIGH SCHOOL – ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECOLOGICAL RISKS**

The site includes:

- Asbestos-containing materials.
- Silica dust risk during demolition.
- Bats.
- Badgers.
- Nesting birds.
- Mature trees including TPO oaks.
- Horse chestnut trees potentially proposed for removal.

Legislative context includes:

- Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981.
- Habitat Regulations 2017.
- Environment Act 2021 (10% Biodiversity Net Gain).
- Control of Asbestos Regulations 2012.
- Environmental Protection Act 1990.

### **Requested Safeguards**

- Demolition Management Plan
- Updated ecological surveys (seasonally valid).
- Bat emergence survey.
- Badger mitigation plan.
- Biodiversity Net Gain metric.
- Arboriculture Impact Assessment confirming TPO retention.
- Protection of root protection areas.
- Demolition Environmental Management Plan.
- Construction Management Plan.
- Dust, air quality and noise mitigation plan(s).

## **11. FLOODING AND DRAINAGE (FW2 & NPPF Section 14)**

There have been historic surface water flooding issues affecting and research shows that this will be an increasing problem.

- Adjacent field.
- Road network.

Even if Flood Zone 1, surface water risk must be addressed.

Policy FW2 requires sustainable urban drainage systems (SuDS).

Requested:

- Surface water strategy.
- Runoff rate comparison to greenfield baseline.
- Long-term maintenance plan.
- Demonstration no increased flood risk to neighbouring streets.
- Provision of a sophisticated SUDS scheme.

## **12. INFRASTRUCTURE CAPACITY**

Under DS3:

- Infrastructure must support growth.

Requested clarification:

- Sewer capacity.
- GP capacity modelling.
- Education capacity impact.
- Utility provider statements.

## **13. REQUESTED MITIGATION CONDITIONS (IF APPROVED)**

- Requests made in email of 17th February 2026 (addressed to David Elkington) (referred to above).
- Height parameter control condition.
- Arboricultural protection condition.
- Ecological mitigation strategy.
- Biodiversity Net Gain condition.
- Demolition Environmental Management Plan including a satisfactory air quality monitoring and noise monitoring scheme that is transparent to residents.
- Construction Traffic Management Plan.
- Parking Management Strategy.
- Surface Water Management Plan.

## **14. RESIDENTS' ROBUST PROFESSIONAL POSITION**

This submission:

- Accepts allocation.

- Accepts housing delivery.

It is a policy-based request for:

- Height moderation.
- Density redistribution and reduction.
- Parking realism.
- Environmental safeguards.

Development must integrate with eastern Kenilworth — not impose a materially more urban form inconsistent with BE1.

## **ADDENDUM A – TECHNICAL REVIEW CHECKLIST**

### **Design & Character**

- Density gradient plan provided
- Perimeter height plan
- Verified cross-sections

### **Amenity**

- BRE daylight/sunlight
- Privacy analysis

### **Highways**

- Parking stress survey
- Staff parking plan
- Peak-hour modelling

### **Ecology**

- Bat survey
- Badger survey
- BNG metric

### **Trees**

- Arboricultural Impact Assessment
- RPA mapping

### **Drainage**

- SuDS strategy
- Flood risk confirmation.

**ADDENDUM B – WDC LOCAL PLAN POLICIES REFERENCED**

DS3 – Sustainable Communities

BE1 – Layout and Design

BE3 – Amenity

TR1 – Access and Choice

HS4 – Affordable Housing

NE2 – Protecting Designated Biodiversity and Geodiversity Assets

NE3 – Biodiversity

FW2 – Sustainable Urban Drainage

Kenilworth Neighbourhood Plan 2017-2029