

**PETITION  
FOR  
THE PROTECTION OF  
HATTON PARK**

**180 HATTON PARK  
RESIDENT'S SIGNATURES**

**These beautiful views from Crombroke Grove  
And**

**Tidmington Close are in danger.**

**Save our Green Belt**

**Prepared by:  
Hatton Park Residents**



Enclosed, please find a signed list of opposition to the proposed development on the green belt adjacent to the existing Hatton Park village development, as well as off the Birmingham Road at Hatton Hill.

Concern and opposition is expressed as there has been no accurate, independently verifiable data provided from any source to support development in the area. In the interests of democracy, and to ensure that all relevant bodies involved within the decision making process are starting on a level playing field, whether it be Warwick DC or Action Groups opposing the plans. Surely, all data both supporting and opposing development should be made readily and easily available to all parties, which is certainly not the case now.

There is absolutely no independent or verifiable data showing a need for housing for local residents in dire need of housing. Therefore, the proposed schemes are likely to be speculative development only for the market as a whole, open to all comers, not solely local residents. As there has been no positive statement or assurance given in either of the proposed developments to confirm that any housing or property built is purely for local residents in need, and indeed, can and will only be sold to them, it can only be concluded that any development is not in fact based on local market needs and is in fact part of an expansion plan for the district, which is entirely different to purporting it is for local need.

There have been no assurances provided by Warwick DC to state that they themselves are acquiring the land by use of Compulsory Purchase Orders in order to ensure that local landowners cannot enjoy windfall profits on green belt land that is otherwise excluded from the development process. If Warwick DC were to buy these sites by way of CPO's, would they not be able to do so based on agricultural values as per the decision in Myers V Milton Keynes, ie, valuing in the No Scheme world? That way any development would ensure development could be targeted to housing need, not developers profit.

With current Government austerity measures, which the Chancellor has confirmed will continue, how will existing local services and infrastructure cope with an increased number of households and residents. As it is understood that further cuts are to come in council services, how can there be any justifiable case for expansion in economic terms. How many more cuts will be suffered under austerity measures? No one can say or predict with accuracy. Therefore, to act with prudence and look after the interests of current local residents, there can be no justification in supporting either scheme, nor indeed for the wider proposals for Warwick district as a whole.

Local infrastructure as a whole is not coping with the existing residents and number of houses. Any further intensive development will paralyse road networks, lengthen doctors, dentists and hospital waiting lists, cause schools to close waiting lists and refuse admissions, and place intolerable burdens on sewage and surface water networks. Then there are the ambulance, fire and police service issues to be taken into account. Are they able to cope with all proposed development contained in the local plan as well as the two local schemes we are opposing?

None of these comments begin to take account of the irrevocable damage that will be done to the amenity of the area by encroaching upon the green belt, destroying wildlife habitats for ever and helping to contribute to the extinction of various species, as well as the loss of arable farming land forever, which surely should be used for producing crops or grazing livestock. When green belts were first created, their very purpose was to prevent unchecked urban sprawl. By encroaching on the green belt, the process of urban sprawl will have begun, and thereafter, will never be stopped. Granting planning permission on the green belt will begin a never ending process of speculative development proposals that will cite any agreed green belt planning consents as precedents. This

will ensure the diminution and eventual destruction of the amenity of the area. As the plan is meant to be for the long term future, should it not be also to ensure the amenity of the area that future generations can actually enjoy, rather than see photographs of what the green belt used to look like before a housing estate was built on it.

It is well known that the granting of outline planning permission is just the beginning of the process, and between this and Detailed Planning consent and Reserved Matters, developers fine tune their schemes and seek to increase the number of dwellings, as was the case on Hatton Park for example. Therefore, residents have not got the true facts as to the size and scale of any development they are expected to approve or reject. Certainly there have been no detailed site plans shown to local residents showing site layouts, density per acre, elevation, materials and construction details,, car parking provision per dwelling for visitors and tradesmen, landscape planning for noise reduction and reducing visual impact, and how surface and ground water are to be dealt with because of real concerns about flooding.

We would like to know from WDC:

- What the exceptional circumstances are, that justify the new development that requires changing the Green Belt.
- The details of the scoring that makes Hatton Park suitable for development.
- Get a proper wildlife habitat survey done for Smiths covert.

Yours faithfully  
Hatton Park Residents

Coordinator