

this e-mail are subject to the terms and conditions expressed in any applicable governing David Leigh-Hunt Solicitors' terms of business or client engagement letter.

----- Original Message -----

**From:** Andrew Jones

**To:** [REDACTED]

**Sent:** Wednesday, January 15, 2014 1:35 PM

**Subject:** Parish Council consultation on houses in Radford Semele

*From Andrew Jones,*

8638

Dear David,

I am replying to the PC circular asking for views on housing proposals for our village. My views are :-

1. Houses should **not** be built on site ( 1 ) being the land adjacent to the Church. The Church is a listed building and its setting needs to be protected. The attempt by the land owner / developer to use " public open space " in front of the church to afford that protection is inadequate . Whilst that public open space would allow some views of the church to be retained, the protection of the heritage site / building needs much more than that. For example, the views when looking out from the church are just as important as those looking in ..... if the field behind Offchurch lane was built on at all it would create a wholly unacceptable vista when viewed from the church itself since the open view across the field and to the border of the old railway line would be lost. Only such a rural setting is acceptable for a listed church which I understand dates back to the middle ages.
2. My second objection to site ( 1 ) concerns traffic and the movement of residents of such a housing development into the village. The site is remote from the village core and the facilities it provides. Thus, usage of the village facilities involves unnecessary dangers in crossing an already busy road and one which will be even busier when the traffic from a site with 100 + houses is added in. Given that Radford Semele was chosen as a potential site for new houses on the basis that it has facilities for new residents such as shops, post office, school, community centre and a pub, it is nonsensical to locate those houses away from the village heart.

3. Instead of using site ( 1 ) , I believe site ( 2 ) .... And possible ( 3 ) should be used. Contrary to the statements by WDC, traffic access to site ( 2 ) can be achieved safely and within guidelines on vision splays and the site could accommodate approximately 125 houses. Additionally, WDC dismissed site ( 2 ) on grounds of high visual impact but that conclusion was reached based on use of the whole swathe of land from the village boundary behind Lewis Rd down to the Fosse Way. Whereas the land which would comprise site ( 2 ) is only a fraction of that area and thus houses could be accommodate on site ( 2 ) with minimal visual impact - a level of impact almost certainly less than the intrusion caused to the church if site ( 1 ) were chosen . Another factor in favour of site ( 2 ) is the footpath which already links the site to the centre of the village - residents could therefore access the village facilities without encountering the dangers of the main Southam road.
4. Lastly, I think some houses could be built on site ( 4 ) .... It has been discounted on the grounds that it would create a connection with Leamington Spa. This is however an incorrect conclusion. Building on site ( 4 ) merely " rounds off " that part of the village whilst leaving a substantial " green wedge " of land to separate Radford Semele from Leamington Spa.

Yours sincerely,

Andrew Jones ( Private e-mail, not one from Dafferns LLP )



**One Eastwood, Harry Weston Road, Binley Business Park, Coventry CV3 2UB**

**T: +44 (0) 24 7622 1046 F: +44 (0) 24 7663 1702**