



Meridienne Exhibitions

Development Policy Manager
Development Services
Warwick District Council
Riverside House
Milverton Hill
Leamington Spa
CV32 5QH

9930

19 July 2013

Dear Sir,

GYPSY AND TRAVELLERS SITE OPTION. SITE GT02

We wish to object to the proposed site GT02 located on the Fosse Way at its junction with the A425.

Our company presents a total of five exhibitions annually at the Warwickshire Exhibition Centre. These exhibitions attract in the region of 18,000 visitors and the location of the proposed site would clearly cause concern both for exhibitors and standholders who would be worried about the security of their goods and property during exhibitions particularly overnight and for visitors who would clearly have an adverse perception as to their vehicle's safety within our car park. It is not unreasonable to draw the conclusion that attendance, both trade and exhibitors, would be greatly reduced as a result of the proximity of the site and that this would have significant effects on the viability of these exhibitions. Equally we would expect public attendance to sharply decline for, as previously stated, visitors would have perceived concerns about car park safety.

We anticipate that in within two years our exhibitions will either cease due to the reduction in trade exhibitors and visitors or, in two instances, possibly been moved to alternative venues. This is not an unreasonable conclusion to draw since the proposed site will be highly visible by nature of its irregularity and location at the foot of valley. It will not be possible to change people's perceptions about this very adverse development which would appear to be favoured directly opposite the exhibition centre entrance and car park.

Our events and those of other organisers contribute significantly to the local economy and provide leisure opportunities for the local community and we trust councillors and officers will take this into consideration when reaching their decisions.

As to the site itself when assessing the criteria by which this possible site will be judged it is clear that in many respects it fails to meet said criteria and the consultant, Enfusion's, report is lacking in detail and inaccurate in several respects. We do not consider the report forms a good basis for judgement nor consider that due diligence was exercised.

Addressing the criteria it is clear that the consultant's report is inaccurate and the residents would not have good access to a GP surgery or schools. As to the location of the site itself it is very close to the junction of two major roads which at peak times see over 2000 vehicle movements per hour. Therefore the residents of the site will be subject to a higher level of noise and air pollution than desirable and increased traffic movements generated by residents would be on to already busy roads. There is clear potential for an increase in accidents and traffic delays particularly at peak times and since the community would have a high density of children being located close to such busy roads is both unsafe and unhealthy.

In respect of services and facilities the site is ill served as there is no main sewerage or gas in the area and furthermore it is on a limited rural electricity supply line which will possibly not meet the increased requirements or if it does it will affect power available to established residences and local businesses. It would therefore, contrary to the criteria, place undue pressure on the local infrastructure and services.

