

WDC PLANNING
Ref
Officer
30 JUL 2013
SCANNED
CC CR PD
GEN D Ref.



Gypsy and Traveller Site Options Response Form 2013

For Official Use Only
10748
Rep. Ref.

Please use this form if you wish to comment on the Gypsy and Traveller Site Options.

If you are commenting on multiple sites 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 consultation documents have 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	MRS.	
First Name	MARGARET	
Last Name	OVERTON	
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 Gypsy and Traveller Site Options

If you are commenting on multiple sites you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation

Sheet of

The policy in the Draft Local Plan will list the criteria by which Gypsy and Traveller sites will be judged for suitability and sustainability. These are the criteria:

- Convenient access to a GP surgery, school and public transport;
- Avoiding areas with a high risk of flooding;
- Safe access to the road network and provision for parking, turning and servicing on site;
- Avoiding areas where there is the potential for noise and other disturbance;
- Provision of utilities (running water, toilet facilities, waste disposal, etc);
- Avoiding areas where there could be adverse impact on important features of the natural and historic environment; and,
- Sites which can be integrated into the landscape without harming the character of the area.
- Promotes peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community;
- Avoids placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services;
- Reflects the extent to which traditional lifestyles (whereby some travellers live and work from the same location thereby omitting many travel to work journeys) can contribute to sustainability.

Please give your views about site suitability below with reference to this list of criteria.

Which site are you responding to?

(e.g. GT01 - Land adj. to the Cobalt Centre, Siskin Drive)

GT11

What is the nature of your representation?

☐

Support

☒

Object

☐

Comment

Please set out full details of your objection or representation of support with reference to the criteria above.

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Gypsy and Travellers Site Options Response Form 2013

Having visited the Exhibition at Shire Hall on 26th June, attended the meeting at Aylesford School on 15th July, and read all available literature, I wish to object to the proposed site GT11 in the strongest possible terms.

While understanding that Warwick District Council has been advised by Government to provide sites for Gypsies and Travellers, I feel - as is often the case nowadays by conventional, tax-paying, settled people - we are too often ignored or pushed aside by Positive Discrimination by both Central and Local Government.

With reference to Part B of the Response Form:

Convenient access to a GP surgery, school and public transport Why? Gypsies and Travellers have cars, and often more available transport than the settled community. Many of us, when choosing to use public transport, have to walk to a bus stop or to a station - these are not always conveniently accessible to us. The same applies to GP surgeries and schools.

Avoiding areas where there is a potential for noise and other disturbance What is meant by this? Potential noise and disturbance towards whom? Gypsies and travellers have chosen the "travelling" tradition so presumably would have become accustomed to a certain amount of noise/disturbance.

With regard to the settled community who will be in close proximity to a site, what safeguards will be put in place with regard to potential noise and disturbance from Gypsy and Traveller Sites?

At the meeting on 15th July, when a question was asked regarding site and pitch size, it was explained by one of the Council Officers that there should be enough room to enable Gypsies and Travellers to carry out their trades on site. In the LOCAL PLAN helping shape the district FAQs document, the third question details the variety of trades including motor trade workers, scrap metal dealers and tree fellers. I have no doubt whatsoever that these trades could seriously impact the settled community where noise is concerned. From my experience of Local Government Planning policies, no one would be given permission to carry out any of these trades from a house/garage within a housing estate (private or social), and I therefore am appalled that this should be considered for the GT11 site which has a large development so near. How much consideration has been given to the "settled community" who uses the area near the proposed site and the footpaths near Warwick Racecourse? We are not overly-compensated for Public Open Space in West Warwick and the Town parks are a good walking distance away (for young parents/retired people); there is an excessively expensive parking charge at St. Nicholas Park. I would humbly suggest Warwick District Council "positively discriminate" towards their council tax payers and give urgent consideration to a disc being supplied or a reduced charge being paid for using the car park facilities. We are penalised by the multitudes of visitors who come by car to Warwick and district.

What was described at the Aylesford School meeting was an almost utopian plan - along with the facility to carry on a trade, an area to graze horses, utility rooms for food preparation and washing areas. Positive Discrimination at its most ludicrous!

/continued:

I have visited the Exhibition at Spine Hall on 30th June, attended the meeting at Ayleston School on 12th July and read all available literature. I wish to object to the proposed site G11 in the strongest possible terms.

While understanding that Warwick District Council has been advised by Government to provide sites for Gypsies and Travellers, I feel - as is often the case nowadays by conventional, tax-paying, settled people - we are too often ignored or pushed aside by Native Discrimination by both Central and Local Government.

With reference to Part B of the Response Form:

Government advice on GP strategy, school and public transport. While Gypsies and Travellers have cars, and often more available transport than the settled community. Many of us, when choosing to use public transport, have to wait to a bus stop or a station - these are not always conveniently accessible to us. The same applies to GP surgeries and schools.

Avoiding areas where there is a potential for noise and other disturbance. What is meant by this? Potential noise and disturbance towards whom? Gypsies and Travellers have chosen the "settling" tradition so presumably would have become accustomed to a certain amount of noise/disturbance.

With regard to the settled community who will be in close proximity to a site, what safeguards will be put in place with regard to potential noise and disturbance from Gypsy and Traveller Sites?

At the meeting on 12th July, when a question was asked regarding site and pitch size, it was explained by one of the Council Officers that there should be enough room to enable Gypsies and Travellers to carry out their trades on site. In the LOCAL PLAN, the third question details the variety of trades including metal workers, scrap metal dealers and tree felling. I have no doubt whatsoever that these trades could seriously impact the settled community where noise is concerned. I too, my experience of Local Government Planning policies, no one would be given permission to carry out any of these trades from a house or garage within a housing estate (private or social), and I therefore am appalled that this should be considered for the G11 site which has a large development so near. How much consideration has been given to the "settled community" who use the area near the proposed site and the footpaths near Warwick Racecourse? We are not over-compensated for Public Open Space in West Warwick and the town parks are a good walking distance away (for young disadvantaged people). There is an excessive, expensive parking charge at St Nicholas Park. I would highly suggest Warwick District Council "positively discriminate" towards their Council tax payers and give urgent consideration to a disc being supplied or a reduced charge being paid for using the car park facilities. We are penalised by the hundreds of visitors who come by car to Warwick and district.

What was described at the Ayleston School meeting was an almost utopian plan - along with the facility to carry on a trade, an area to graze horses, stables, areas for food preparation and washing areas. Positive Discrimination at its most ludicrous!

Avoids placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services: I cannot personally comment on the pressure that might be put on local schools, but I think both the local primary/junior and senior schools will be at bursting point when the Warwick Chase development is completed. I am most concerned (65+ years) at the effect the GT11 site will have on our local GP surgery and the local NHS hospitals. The New Dispensary Surgery, Alder Meadow, which I am assuming would be used, is superb and we have no complaints. However, unless we have an emergency situation, we are often given an appointment 2 weeks later. The Warwick Chase development and the proposed 12 pitches would add even further pressure to their already stretched resources.

We were given the impression at the meeting on 15th July that, although access to potential sites will be considered by the Council, the site needs to meet the requirements of the Highway Authority of Warwick County Council. The County Council obviously has no idea that the road situation in this area is no better than very poor. The through roads in the Chase Meadow development are too narrow and always over-parked. It is an estate that cries out for double yellow lines and rigorous enforcement. The Stagecoach bus drivers have to thread their vehicles from side to side of the roads to follow their route. An accident involving a child or children is inevitable in time. Presumably, this route could be used by Gypsies and Travellers to access the M40 (North and South) or the 'A' roads out of Warwick. Shakespeare Avenue is another option but is no better – narrow road, tight roundabout, houses and children. Hampton Road going towards the town is narrow (alongside the racecourse grandstand) and always solidly parked; the County Council have failed to correct that for the settled community, and the District Council will be actively contributing to the volume of traffic with, sometimes, oversize vehicles. Perhaps, also, very careful consideration could be given to the disaster that is called High/Jury Streets. I have not heard one positive comment about the so-called improvements carried out last year. If the straddled parking was to slow traffic it has had little or no effect. The traffic is slowed by virtue of the parking and the volume of traffic. Lorries and trucks have to thread their way through and the "pedestrian" humps (for example, the one that crosses from Church Street to Castle Street) have not helped pedestrians/tourists, merely confused them. Pedestrians do not halt as they would at a pedestrian crossing but walk across them as though they are continuance of the pavement; recently, when we were crawling along High Street, our car was kicked because we did not stop to let a man cross in front of us.

I also wish to be assured that the appropriate council tax will be charged/collected from the Travelling families to supplement the Government's grant to the local Councils for education and social services. I would also like to be advised how National Insurance is paid/collected to enable Gypsies and Travellers to access the provisions of the NHS.

If the Local Plan is to be open, transparent and fair to everyone, I think the settled community have a right to have these questions answered.

-----oOo-----

Avoids putting undue pressure on local primary schools. I cannot personally comment on the pressure that might be put on local schools but I think that the local primary/uniformed senior schools will be at a planning point when the Warwick Chase development is completed. I am least concerned (5-6 years) at the effect the CHH site will have on the local primary and the local NHS hospitals. The New Dispensary Surgery, Alder Meadow, which I am assuming would be used, is superb and we have no complaints. However, unless we have an emergency situation, we do often give an appointment 2 weeks later. The Warwick Chase development and the proposed 12 pitches would add a further pressure to their already stretched resources.

We were given the impression at the meeting that, although access to potential sites will be considered by the Council, the site needs to meet the requirements of the Highway Authority of Warwick County Council. The County Council obviously has considered that the road situation in this area is no better than very poor. The through roads in the Chase Meadow development are too narrow and always over-packed. It is an estate that cries out for double yellow lines and rigorous enforcement. The Stagecoach bus drivers have to travel their 7-8 mile round trip in the way that follows their route. An accident involving a child or children is inevitable in time. Presumably, the route could be used by Gypsies and Travellers to access the NHS (North and South) or the 'A' roads out of Warwick. Shakespeare Avenue is another option but is no better - narrow road, tight roundabout, houses and children. Hampton Road going towards the town is narrow (alongside the narrow road) and always solidly parked. The County Council has failed to correct that for the settled community and the District Council will be actively continuing to do so. I am not sure if traffic with some of the vehicles. Perhaps, also, very careful consideration will be given to the disaster that is called Highway Street. I have not heard any positive comment about the so-called improvements carried out last year. If the strangled parking was to slow traffic it has had little or no effect. The traffic is slowed by virtue of the parking and the volume of traffic. Lorries and heavy trucks to thread their way through and the "pedestrian" bunnies (for example, the one that lives in the front of the Castle Street) have not helped pedestrianise the area, merely confused them. Pedestrians do not halt as they would at a pedestrian crossing but walk across them as though they were a part of the pavement. Recently, when we were crawling along High Street, our car was stuck in traffic and I did not stop to let a man cross in front of us.

I also wish to be assured that the appropriate arrangements will be changed/collected from the Travelling families to supplement the Government's grant to the local Council for education and social services. I would also like to be advised how National Insurance contributions collected to enable Gypsies and Travellers to access the facilities of the NHS.

If the Local Plan is to be open, transparent and fair to all, I think the settled community have a right to have these questions answered.

Part B - Commenting on the Gypsy and Traveller Site Options

If you are commenting on multiple sites you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation

Sheet of

Do you have any other suggestions for land within this district that you think would be suitable for use as a Gypsy and Traveller site, bearing in mind the criteria for site identification? If so, please give the location and the land owner's details below:

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.