



Development Policy Manager
Development Services
Warwick District Council
Riverside House
Milverton Hill
LEAMINGTON SPA,
CV32 5QH

Dear Sir,

Local Plan - Revised Development Strategy Consultation Process

As a resident of Bishop's Tachbrook, I wrote to you in 2009 in response to the Core Strategy Preferred Options - letter attached. I find that in this latest Consultation nothing has changed for the better in its implications for our community and for quality of life. The comments I made in 2009 still very much pertain and are even more relevant.

Firstly, we do **not need** the proposed 12,300 houses in Warwick District. Using material from the 2011 Census in 2013, Co. Ray Bullen considers that only 5,400 homes are actually needed, allowing for natural population growth and migration. Your own consultants, G.L. Hearn, gave an Economic and Demographic Forecast Study in Dec. 2012 and concluded that only 4,405 new homes were needed in their PROJ 5 option. Why do you go against you own consultants?

Housing is not needed for new jobs as unemployment is very low at 1.7% and the 2012 Strategic Housing Market Assessment concluded that we 'had a very good jobs - homes balance'. If the proposed houses are supposed to serve people working at the new Gateway project in Coventry, then the Planners should be ashamed of themselves, clogging up the roads' system with even more commuters, adding to the already illegally heavy pollution and costing families aa fortune in fuel. Homes should be built where the jobs are. Gallagher's have been trying to sell their land to industry and businesses at Heathcote/Warwick Gates for years and not succeeded, so now they want to change the land use to house-building, in an area where there is no employment so the residents will have to commute. Result: gridlock and pollution.

The proposals to extend Warwick Gates and Whitnash southwards towards Bishop's Tachbrook will totally ruin the skyline and rural views from our village. The proposed houses will be on rising land and hillsides of the Tach Brook and will not be hidden by the sop of the so-called 'Country Park' around the southern edge. In 2006 the Planning Inspector who reviewed the current Local Plan stated that Woodside Farm should not be built upon now on in the future, and in 2009 your own landscape consultant, Richard Morrish, in the Landscape Area Statement referred to the land south of Gallows Hill saying that it 'should **not** be considered for urban extension and that the rural character should be safeguarded form development'. Why has WDC gone against all the advice from experts in the field?

With a minimum of 4,200 proposed houses on the south side of Leamington and Warwick and the conservative average of 2 cars per household, the congestion on the roads will be an even worse nightmare than it is at present. The Local Plan RDS does not contain any

evidence to show that the proposed road improvements can be delivered purely from the Developer contributions through Section 106 and Community Infrastructure Levy. How is the balance of the costs of such improvements to be met? When recent, lengthy work was done (and very badly managed) on the roads when The Foundry / Morrisons site was developed, there was utter gridlock for months. If the proposed 'Junction Improvements Grade 1 and 2' are made, we will have more years of traffic misery.

Warwick & Leamington are already severely affected by all through routes, each having to negotiated bridges for railways, rivers and canals. The cost of wider, stronger bridges would be prohibitive and it would be totally irresponsible to even contemplate building such a vast number of houses in the area. Each visit to shopping, hospital, banks etc. would necessitate going through these 'pinch points' and your own Warwick Strategic Transport Phase 3 Assessment, Appendix E, shows that traffic speeds, after the road improvements, would be only 0-10 mph in many places with heavy congestion elsewhere.

As far as Bishop's Tachbrook is concerned, your proposal of 100-150 houses is excessive. We recently ran our own housing needs survey which identifies a local need for only 14 homes, of which 10 were affordable and 4 others. With the building quotas of 40% affordable in any development, a mixed development of 25 - 30 homes could provide the 10 affordable homes needed. Why should villages nearest to Warwick and Leamington be considered 'Primary service villages' and have to build more houses than those needed? Is it so that we can easily be joined up and subsumed into the urban sprawl? 150 extra would swamp the village and the school and doctors could not cope.

Sites for Gypsy and Travellers Consultation Document

I can appreciate that WDC is legally bound to provide G&T sites, but to avoid the nuisance that they can bring I believe that they should be restricted to 5 units per site. I understand that each unit can have a static home, a mobile caravan and as many vans and vehicles that each family member needs. That means a lot of buildings / vehicles per unit and multiplied by five alone would be a large site and eyesore. If the G & Ts want to have larger family groups, then they should be expected to travel to visit relatives, as the rest of us do - they are 'travellers', after all. As a retired parish priest, I have had personally experienced the nuisance and unpleasantness Gypsies and Travellers can bring - begging door-to-door, verbal abuse when given food parcels instead of cash and the many sob-stories, (always at weekends when they say benefit offices are closed) when they need cash for train fares for some 'family crisis' etc. I have also seen the squalor around some of their caravans and homes - dumps of trees and bushes which they have felled for customers, broken concrete, from driveways, old furniture etc.

Options 5, 10 and 15 could severely affect Bishop's Tachbrook. Our village school is full and always oversubscribed with appeals each year for places. Would Gypsy and Traveller children have priority over children from our parish? Would extra funding follow them for their special needs? Our Health Centre is a branch from Sydenham and is only open half time. It runs to capacity for most of the year.

I would be very concerned about road safety for vans and large caravans turning into the sites, either off the Banbury Road, Mallory Road or Europa Way - they are busy roads. I also know that the National Guides Dogs Breeding Centre is concerned at the proximity of site no.10 to their new centre because of the possibility of infection from dogs left to roam. Also, Oakley Wood is a very special amenity thanks to the financial support of WDC and ADC and various volunteer bodies. Much work has and is being done to preserve and re-establish the ancient woodland and I wonder if the G&T community would respect, or would it be seen as a ready source of firewood? The area is quiet and peaceful and an appropriate setting for the Crematorium. Would a G&T site disrupt this peace?

As I said in my letter of 2009, we moved here on our retirement, specifically to be in a rural location for clean air (I have asthma), but also for reasonably easy access to health care, hospitals etc when we need them. Are these aspirations now to be lost to excess housing and traffic chaos and fumes and disruptive neighbours? I hope not.

I look forward to your reply.

