

# LOCALPLAN

helpingshapethedistrict

WARWICKSHIRE  
DIRECT  
30 JUL 2013  
LEAMINGTON



## Revised Development Strategy Response Form 2013

For Official Use Only  
Ref: 9701  
Rep. Ref.

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](http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan)

### Part A - Personal Details

	1. Personal Details	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	MRS	
First Name	JANE	
Last Name	CANWING	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1		
Address Line 2		
Address Line 3		
Address Line 4		
Postcode		
Telephone number		
Email address		
Would you like to be made aware of future consultations?		
About You: Gender		
Ethnic Origin		
Age		
Where did you hear about this consultation e.g. radio, newspaper, word of mouth, exhibitions, bin hanger?		

## 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?

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

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).

See attached form, I endorse  
very strongly these points  
and wish my opposition to  
be considered.

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

## Representations to WDC's Consultation Programme on the Revised Development Strategy for both the Local Plan and the Sites for Gypsies and Travellers

- Site 16 – is actually the flood compensation area from the Barford bypass build and contains a permanent central pond and is unsuitable for any form of development
- Sites 12 and 16 – sit within (part) and otherwise immediately adjacent to areas identified by the Environment Agency as having significant flood risk.
- Sites 12 and 16 – a number of residents have reported the existence of water voles in and immediately adjacent to these sites. Water voles are, of course, now a legally protected species.
- Sites 12 and 16 – there is inadequate pedestrian crossing facilities for safe access into the village.
- Sites 6 and 9 – These sites are situated on historic landfills which though closed may still have the potential to release greenhouse gases and are unsuitable for any form of permanent habitation and occupation.
- Sites 10 and 20 - These sites are situated adjacent to historic landfills which though closed may still have the potential to release greenhouse gases are unsuitable for any form of permanent habitation and occupation.
- Sites 6 and 9 – sit immediately approximate to the Asps which Warwick District Council decided, after further research regarding the landscape and transport impact of development, that site should remain open due its value as a backdrop to the historic Warwick Castle Park. The Revised Development Strategy, therefore, excludes the Asps and should also exclude the adjoining sites 6 and 9 for the same reasons.
- Sites 6 and 9 – there have been a number of reported wild deer sightings on this land and there is a population of deer that roam freely across the Castle grounds on to these 2 sites and beyond.
- Sites 12 and 16 – vehicular access to these sites is from the A429 trunk road which was constructed as a bypass to Barford. It is a 60 mph speed limit road and there have been a significant number of accidents on it since its opening, including a fatality. The existing access into the sites is entirely inadequate.
- Sites 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 20 – vehicular access to these sites is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and egress to and from these sites to the highways network would not be safe.
- Sites 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 20 – the sites are not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. None of the sites offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.
- Sites 5, 6, 9, 12, 16 and 20 – development would lead to an unacceptable loss of farmland and rural employment, rendering the isolated sites (eg site 12) totally unviable.

- Sites 5, 6, 9, 10, 12 and 16 – development would have a material negative impact on the capacity of Barford St. Peter's School, especially given the village's status as a "Secondary Service Village" and it's likely requirement to provide 70-90 new dwellings during the Plan period.
- Sites 5, 6, 9, 12, 16 and 20 – WDC have disregarded their own Rural Area Policies, especially RAPs 1 (New Housing), 6 (New Employment), 10 (Safeguarding Rural Roads) and 15 (Camping and caravan Sites). In all respects the sites fail to meet the policy criteria to allow any form of development.
- Sites 5, 6, 9, 12, 16 and 20 – the development of all of these sites could not take place without a material adverse effect on the landscape and could not be integrated without harming the visual amenity of the sites.
- Sites 5, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18 and 20 – are not locations which allow peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.
- Availability – only 3 of the sites listed are available, namely sites 15, 17 and 18. By definition the remaining sites are not deliverable.
- WDC should have identified brownfield sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.
- WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctors surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.
- Ecology and Environment – all of the sites have some ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.
- WDC should revisit its Greenbelt Policy and release sites to the north of Warwick and Leamington which would reduce the pressure to allocate land for all forms of development during the new Local Plan period to the south of the District.
- WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a 'buffer' to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not 'swallowed up' by Warwick and Leamington over time.