

LOCAL PLAN

helpingshapethedistrict

WDC PLANNING
Ref
Officer
17 JUL 2013
SCANNED
CC CR PD MA
PRE GEN DIS



For Official Use Only
Ref: 9671
Rep. Ref.

Revised Development Strategy Response Form 2013

Please use this form if you wish to support or object to the Local Plan - Revised Development Strategy.

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document you will need to complete a separate copy of Part B of this form for each representation.

This form may be photocopied or, alternatively, extra forms can be obtained from the Council's offices or places where the plan has been made available (see back page). You can also respond online using the LDF Consultation System, visit: www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan

Part A - Personal Details

	1. Personal Details	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	MR	
First Name	JONATHAN	
Last Name	FORBES	
Job Title (where relevant)	RETIRED	
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1	[REDACTED]	
Address Line 2		
Address Line 3		
Address Line 4		
Postcode		
Telephone number		
Email address		
Would you like to be made aware of further information?		
About You: Gender		
Ethnic Origin		
Age		
Where did you hear about this consultation e.g. radio, newspaper, word of mouth, exhibitions, bin hanger?	WORD OF MOUTH	

Part B - Commenting on the Revised Development Strategy

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation

Sheet of

Which part of the document are you responding to?

RDS ~~2~~ 1

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

4.1.5

Map (e.g. Proposed Development Sites – District Wide)

What is the nature of your representation?

Support

Object

Please set out full details of your objection or representation of support. If objecting, please set out what changes could be made to resolve your objection (Use a separate sheet if necessary).

OBJECTION TO

“THE LOCAL PLAN – REVISED DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY” [Reference A]

I am writing to strongly object to the above document as it relates to the impact it will have on Warwick, RDS3. The plan seems to me to go against logic and, most importantly, is advocating jeopardising the attractive characteristics of this lovely old historic town which brings so many overseas and local visitors. By this plan Warwick will be overwhelmed by vehicles (with their attendant air pollution) when there is serious doubt about how many houses are actually required.

It is fundamental to any such plan stretching forward many years that the requirements for new units are founded on objective, reliable assumptions. Each element giving rise to housing need must be scrutinised with the utmost care without any but the most substantive factors being included. The Local Plan quotes 12,000 houses as being the overall requirement. This is based on demographic data but also the proposition that more industry will be attracted to the area. I find it difficult to see the soundness of a high incremental amount of houses relating to incoming industry given the probable level of economic activity in UK, Europe and America in the next decade. Much of the world is now working at a very low level of capacity and, because of the burden of debt, will continue to work at a historically low level for some years. The world has changed: the financial and Euro crisis have dampened down the world economy and even China and India are reducing their forecasts. The Warwick Society has been making very careful calculations on this subject for some time which I understand has been passed to WDC. They predict that only half of the houses, (6,000) of what is now quoted in the Local Plan (12,000) are needed by 2029. The Warwick Society figures have been backed up by G L Hearn's findings, (your consultants), so it is very disturbing to find that such a hugely different and inflated figure has been publicised as a basis for house building. Its ramifications are immense: road network plans could be widely out, the burden on all services will be hugely different and should those extra houses be built (like Eire's massive housing boom) whole estates will be empty and a large area of countryside will be spoilt on pure speculation. The rationale needs to be thoroughly thought through again and the Plan revised accordingly.

With this lower figure much of the clamour being created by the current draft Local Plan will subside as many local services will probably be able to cope and the character of the area will not be changed in the drastic way the Plan predicts.

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Part B - Commenting on the Revised Development Strategy

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document, you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation

Sheet of

Which part of the document are you responding to?

RDS 3

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

4.3.11 & 5.1.15

Map (e.g. Proposed Development Sites - District Wide)

What is the nature of your representation?

Support

Object

Please set out full details of your objection or representation of support. If objecting, please set out what changes could be made to resolve your objection (use a separate sheet if necessary).

An important characteristic of Warwick is the current reasonable co-existence of car and pedestrian traffic around the Avon Bridge, St Nicholas, Jury St and Smith St. Car parks and over flow car parks (such as Myton Fields when major events are held in the town and at the Castle) enable residents, visitors and tourists to park and walk the short distance to visit or shop in the town and they do so in their hundreds. Over loading the roads will dislocate this balance between motorist and pedestrian. Paragraph 4.3.11 of Reference A speaks of "mitigation" without providing evidence on a most crucial part of this plan. The scheme being proposed of widening the Banbury Road to the Avon Bridge shows that the planners of this scheme are in denial: the roads are hardly coping now and will not be able to cope with more traffic. It is not in the interest of Warwick. In short the road for Warwick proposals smack of desperation. Tourism is the one of the major sources of income and employment of Warwick and aggravating the traffic flow by adding extra vehicles can only cause damage to the local economy and the day-to-day life of the town for residents. The idea that a dual carriageway to the Avon Bridge will do anything but cause a bottleneck and traffic jams is beyond belief. This is clear from the scenes that already occur when there is an accident on the M40 and traffic diverts into Warwick. Traffic surveys that have been done show that traffic at peak hours is already at congestion point, and at times at saturation point. Importantly it goes directly against the Traffic Forums policies (to which Warwick District Council is a party) agreed in 2007 of (a) reducing air pollution and (b) reducing traffic volumes, work now being taken forward by the Joint Study Group. This finds no expression in the plan, a glaring omission.

Concentrations of slow moving vehicular traffic cause major pollution issues and this is another important side effect of adding to the Banbury Road traffic volumes. It will add to health problems for those in the area and ways to kerb any extra traffic need to be considered seriously. This aspect has been ignored in the plan.

In summary I object in the strongest terms to the plan, Reference A, as I believe such an unbalanced scheme would cause serious damage to the economy and the interests of this beautiful historic English town and thereby spoil it forever. It goes against declared and agreed policies of The Forum (and therefore WDC). Furthermore there are well known alternatives which can provide much better solutions to this complex problem.

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.