

OBJECTION

We, the undersigned, object to the Green Belt/Green Field preferred option for residential development in Hill Wootton on the following grounds;

1. The field in question has a history of failed planning applications and a rejection at appeal, all of which state that this field and the lane it is situated on *adjoin* the hamlet of Hill Wootton and does not constitute 'infill'. It is not a 'gap'. The opinion of W.D.C. itself as stated in Appendix 6 of The Local Plan 2013 is *'The open Character of Hill Wootton currently makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt. This sub- parcel could not easily accommodate a limited infill, without compromising its essential open character, and the fundamental aim and purpose of the Green Belt'*. It is situated in an agricultural area in a lane which leads to a working farm and which adjoins the settlement.
2. Any development of this field will seriously compromise the Green Belt and encourage applications to further encroach upon it which will then be difficult to refuse. Appendix 6 *'Long term negative effect on prudent use of Green Belt Land on the edge of the village.'*
3. There are no 'special circumstances' which necessitate the use of this piece of Green Belt land. Serious doubts regarding the suitability of this land for development are raised in Appendix 6 of The New Local Plan 2013, and echo our own.
4. The Local Plan has identified the potential for 10 houses on a field of this size, scaling down the number to 5 at the landowner's request. This represents, at worse, a 40% increase on the current housing number of 25 inhabited houses within the boundary or at best a 20% increase in this tiny hamlet. This is far in excess of what is being asked of other locations, excepting Leek Wootton, and will change its nature completely.
5. If the land is adopted and purchased by a developer what is to stop 10 houses being built there? This would be insensitive development of an area which is essentially agricultural and totally out of keeping with the nature of the hamlet.
6. Importantly, a housing development will negatively affect the working of the farm (whose farm buildings adjoin it on one side) and the running of the Equine training facility and livery at the further end of the lane. In fact, the farmer is of the opinion that a development here could make it impossible to carry on with the effective running of the farm. Heavy farm machinery, horse boxes and horses constantly use the lane in which the access to the proposed development is indicated. The lane itself is the only access to the agricultural, farmed land which runs down to the Avon and additional overspill parked vehicles from a relatively large development, and general traffic engendered by it will greatly hinder the farmer's ability to move his vehicles up and down from the fields.
7. Access to a development on the lane involves a dangerous blind crossroads followed by a right turn across a completely blind bend at the corner of the field in question, over the years the scene of many accidents where cars coming from the opposite direction end up in the ditch or against the telegraph pole.
8. Farm buildings in a poor state of repair abutting the land could pose a danger to residents of any development there.

9. Existing problems with **drainage** in the area have not been examined. In the corner of the field on the blind bend opposite the farmhouse are Severn Trent pipes serving at least three houses opposite.

10. **Amenities.** There are NONE. There are no street lights, no GAS. Any housing built here would be dependant on the more expensive forms of heating, oil or electricity. There is no public transport within reasonable walking distance. A bus stop in Leek Wootton is 1200 metres away (contrary to the 400 metres quoted in App. 6, that is an error, see googlemaps which gives 1200 metres to the Leek Wootton Bus stop and the same to Kenilworth Road) and as a consequence Hill Wootton has been identified by W.D.C. as being too far from public transport to expect children to use it to get to school and *free taxis* are provided. Pensioners applying for bus passes are entitled to taxi vouchers. There are no pavements on either approach to Hill Wootton, essential drainage ditches prevent them from the Leek Wootton approach, it is too narrow from the Kenilworth Road, one car width only in places. Commuters and shoppers in Hill Wootton have to use cars.

11. There is concern about the redrawing of the boundary. Knowledge of the hamlet does not appear to have been considered. For example, Tower House has been excluded even though Hilary Farm opposite has been included. The lane, always regarded as the 'agricultural' end of Hill Wootton has been included.

12. Hill Wootton is essentially rural with a working farm and liveries at either end, and surrounded on all sides by agricultural land. It is enjoyed by many as a rural retreat in our already built up area. It is totally inappropriate that it should be 'inset' losing the protective wash of the Green Belt.

There are more suitable and sensitive opportunities for small scale development in Hill Wootton, which would not affect the street scene or change the nature of the hamlet, which have not been explored. A more sensitive alternative would be to invite landowners to offer them so that W.D.C. can assess them for their viability. There is also potential in the long term for the development of existing buildings which would be more in keeping with the rural nature of Hill Wootton. A development of 5 or more houses on the field in question would be entirely unworkable, inappropriate and out of character.

Supporting docs Hill Wootton
V. 9 Page 50
2

C/894/WP/P

Department of the Environment and
Department of Transport



Common Services

Room 1417 Tollgate House Houlton Street Bristol BS2 9DJ

Telex 449321

Direct line 0272-218 927

Switchboard 0272-218811

GTN 2074

SECRETARY OF STATE
28 AUG 1987
WARWICK DISTRICT
C 31

Mr R A Geden ARIBA
18 Hertford Street
COVENTRY
CV1 1LF

Your reference

Our reference

T/APP/T3725/A/87/067791/P5

Date

27 AUG 87

Sir

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1971, SECTION 36 AND SCHEDULE 9
APPEAL BY MISS M HARMER
APPLICATION NO: W.861090

- As you know I have been appointed by the Secretary of State for the Environment to determine the above mentioned appeal which is against the decision of Warwick District Council to refuse planning permission for the erection of 3 detached houses on land adjacent to Rose Cottage, Hill Wootton Road, Hill Wootton, Warwickshire. I have considered the written representations made by you, the Council, the Parish Council and other interested persons. I inspected the site on 6 July 1987.
- Both you and the Council draw my attention to the Warwickshire County Structure Plan, its submitted Review, and the draft modifications to it which were published by the Secretary of State in August 1986. I am also referred to the Green Belt Local Plan; the urban Structure Plan for Kenilworth and Leamington, Department of the Environment Circulars Nos 42/55, 22/80, 14/84, and Development Control Policy Note No. 4 'Development in Rural Areas' (DCPN4), all of which I agree are relevant to this case.
- The site, the subject of this appeal, is situated on the western side of Hill Wootton which is a small rural settlement approximately 3 miles to the south of Kenilworth and a similar distance to the north of Leamington Spa. The land concerned is roughly rectangular in shape, has an area of about 0.5 ha (1.24 acres) and is situated on the southern side of Hill Wootton Road immediately to the north of its junction with a lane which leads down to the River Avon. The site has frontages to the Hill Wootton Road and the lane along its eastern boundary of approximately 70 m (230 ft) and 58 m (190 ft) respectively, and it is bounded by a mixture of hedgerows and fencing except along its southern edge where there is a line of farm buildings. Access into the land is from the lane along its eastern boundary.
- From the representations made and my inspection of the site, it is my view that the main issue in this case is whether or not the proposed development would undermine unacceptably the intention of the Council, which is to restrict severely the development of new housing in this part of the Green Belt.
- The Council state that the appeal site is within the Warwickshire portion of the West Midlands Green Belt where it is intended that new residential development will not be permitted unless it complies with certain criteria, is justified by exceptional circumstances, or relates to the development of a single dwelling or small group of houses within the confines of an existing settlement - providing that it can be shown that the need cannot be met elsewhere. (In the draft modifications to the Review County Structure Plan published in August 1986, the Secretary of State has made it clear that he is considering amending this policy to exclude such development

REFUSAL

D.C. REF. W74/007

NOTICE OF DECISION OF DISTRICT PLANNING AUTHORITY

Town and Country Planning Act, 1971

Town and Country Planning General Development Order, 1973

TO Ronald D. Bradshaw, Esq., B.A. (Hons.), F.R.I.B.A.,

OF Apollo House,

85 Priory Road, Enfield, CV8 1LN.

THE WARWICK DISTRICT COUNCIL, having considered

the application for permission to carry out development at O.S. No. 103, Hill Wootton

Fort Hill N. Hammar.

deposited with the Council on the 25th day of October, 19 74.

HEREBY GIVE YOU NOTICE that PERMISSION is REFUSED for the following development, namely:-

Proposed Residential Development, 1.25 acres approx.

The reasons for the Council's decision to refuse permission for the development are:-

1. The site is situated within the area proposed for confirmation as interim Green Belt where it is the Planning Authority's policy that development will be severely controlled and the applicant has submitted no over-riding reasons for the proposal.
2. This development would not accord with the County Structure Plan which proposes the retention of the existing agricultural use of the land. It would constitute a residential development in an area where the Planning Authority would not normally permit residential development unless it were justified by agricultural needs. There is no evidence that it is so justified and there therefore appears no cause to depart from the plan in order to permit the development applied for.
3. It is further contended that should permission be granted in this case, it would encourage the submission of further similar proposals for development within this part of the Green Belt, which would then be difficult to refuse.

REASONS FOR REFUSAL

DATED the 29th day of November, 19 74.

AUTHORISED OFFICER OF THE COUNCIL

IT IS IMPORTANT THAT YOU READ THE NOTES ON THE REVERSE SIDE OF THIS FORM.

AS/LJR