

Development Policy Manager

Development Services

Warwick District Council

Riverside House, Milverton Hill

Leamington Spa

Warwickshire

CV32 5QH

Dear Sirs

I am writing in response to the proposed gypsy and traveller sites in the parish of Bishops Tachbrook.

It appears that the majority of sites have been proposed around the small unique village of Bishops Tachbrook, in fact 6/20. Our village has few resources. We have a grade 1 listed church, a sports and social club built through fund raising and used by many of the village groups and the volunteers that run the groups and the small primary school. We choose to live without further resources through our own choice and most villagers commute outside the village to work. I question where the gypsy travelling community are going to find work locally?

The school is over subscribed. It's a single form entry and is always at capacity. I again question that the school will not have the resources to be able to support children that have received very little if not any formal education and will struggle to integrate into that environment. The school relies on parents – that give up their time to come in and help teach and read with pupils. As over 81% of gypsy and traveller children's parents are illiterate – then these children will need even more support from existing parents that support the school and will put their own children at a potential disadvantage. The school simply will not be able to meet the requirements of these children.

Secondary schools are also over subscribed in the area. We already have concerns that there will not be adequate provision for the current population of the parish.

All the sites suggested in our parish are too remote from employment and facilities and I suggest are unsuitable for this type of development.

There is a very limited public transport option – I lived here as a parent without a car for three years and life was very difficult so again I question those travellers that need to use public transport to reach employment elsewhere will struggle.

My concerns for the sites are as such

GT03 is very remote and not in reach of major amenities

GT04 again is remote

GT05 has access onto a very busy road, with cars travelling at speed. This would be dangerous to introduce caravans turning into the site, and pedestrian access is dangerous. I would argue that to even build a footpath alongside that road would be dangerous and there is no footpath to reach any facilities. This site would also have a negative visual impact on the approach to historic Warwick and therefore effect local business dependent on tourists in a negative way. There are also listed buildings on that site in need of protection.

GT06 very remote and again no pedestrian access

GT09 has no pedestrian access and again a negative visual impact onto visitors to Warwick.

GT10 is close to the Blind National Breeding Centre and I would question the risk of disease from unvaccinated pets and animals belonging to the gypsies.

GT15 is on the banks of the Tachbrook. As most travellers seem to be able to earn an income on site I would question that the proposed site could cause a chance of pollution to the brook which is unacceptable.

In general all these sites have no adequate bus stops, and are on busy roads.

No path or pavement to walk anywhere and cycling is dangerous on busy commuter routes.

Children cannot be allowed to stand on a busy road to wait for transport to school.

Whilst I appreciate that the council is under an obligation to provide some permanent pitches I strongly feel that the sites chosen are unsuitable.

The sites would provide undue strain on local resources that are already stretched to capacity. At a recent meeting I asked a planning officer where the occupiers of the proposed thousands of new build homes would work – an answer could not be provided. Therefore in addition to the fierce competition amongst the educated workforce, I fail to see how the people educated to a poor standard (81% are illiterate) will be able to compete and obtain legal work and contribute to our small community.

Whilst I appreciate the governments' decision to try and move this ethnic minority into permanent sites and this is being supported by the police "so we know where they are" I feel it is wrong to move them into areas of good quality arable land to do so. Most of these people already have a brick built home either in the UK or in Ireland and to carve up our countryside to provide them with a second home is simply wrong.

In the consultation brochure published by WDC, the pictures taken of caravans and awnings all neatly lined up – I would like to know which authorised site that is? The travellers that have just moved from Barford have left used sanitary towels, faeces and gas canisters littering the bushes! I have pictures taken if you would like to see them.

With the new housing been built as a new barrier between us and essential services such as the hospital and fire stations then an authorised site that will need to be accessible to all three services should be located closer to them.

Please do not hesitate to get in contact if you require any further verification of my objections.

Yours faithfully

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the signature area.