



The Development Policy Manager,
Warwick District Council,
Milverton Hill,
Leamington Spa
CV32 5QH

Dear Sir or Madam,

Reference GT 02- Land abutting the Fosse Way with B4245 Objection

I wish to put on record my objection to the proposed plans for travellers at the above referenced site. There seems to have been no consultation or dialogue with the Travellers, local community and residents as to their wishes and aspirations. Who is to be the judge of this?

It is difficult to comprehend how site fulfills the criteria in the Draft Local Plan for the following reasons:-

1 Convenient access to GP surgery/school/public transport.

The site is in excess of 1.5 miles from any surgery, is outside the catchment area of Harbury Surgery and the nearest being one in Sydenham which is over 3 miles away. This I believe cannot take more patients. Regarding schools the site is outside the catchment area for Harbury (School oversubscribed) and within the catchment for Radford Primary which is almost fully subscribed.

2 Safe access to the road network.....

The proposed site will generate much extra traffic on what is now a very busy and hazardous road which is designated as a high risk route by the County Council. Turning, entering and exiting will present dangers to fast moving traffic and add significantly to existing delays at peak times.

3 Provision of Utilities.....

The proposed site has neither mains sewerage, drainage, nor gas so fails to meet the criteria you set. The electricity supply may well need to be upgraded to meet this increase in demand.

4 Avoiding areas where there could be an adverse impact..

The site is adjacent to the Fosse Way an old Roman road with obvious historical interest. Close by are woodlands containing flora, fauna and rare species.

5 Sites which can be integrated...

This is a large site about four times the size of the Exhibition Centre and once additions are made could be even more. There will be a large number and type of caravans on site which to my mind cannot be integrated into the landscape without harming the visual aspect and character of the area.

6 Promotes peaceful and integrated coexistence....

How can this be determined when there has been neither dialogue nor discourse with the affected parties? It is at times such as these when a situation is presented like this that feelings run high: doubts and misunderstandings prevail leading to misunderstandings.

7 Avoids placing undue pressure on local infrastructure...

There being no utilities this appears to fail the criteria. To fulfill this would need great expenditure at a time when funds are in short supply.

8 Reflects the extant to which traditional lifestyles...

Have the Travellers been consulted as to the requirements of their traditional lifestyles? if they work from home, what is this work and what view will Planning make of this? Is it to be industrial use? Again Planning must have a view on this.

In conclusion, i have to express disappointment that a document can be presented to a community in such a way as this. It is to my mind a "Fait Accompli" which by its very nature causes uncertainty both for the local inhabitants and the Travellers alike. In these circumstances, and in its present state I must oppose the proposal.

Yours faithfully,



David Powell-Tuck