

Gypsy and Traveller Preferred Options Sites Response Form 2014

For Official Use Only

Ref: 10614

Rep. Ref.

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

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

M/S

First Name

Jennifer

Last Name

MALONE

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

About You: Gender

Ethnic Origin

Age

Where did you hear about this consultation e.g. radio, newspaper, word of mouth, exhibitions?

Part B - Commenting on the Gypsy and Traveller Preferred Sites

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

Sheet 1 of 2

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:

- Impact on the green belt
- Impact on Landscape character
- Impact on heritage assets and the settings of heritage assets
- Impact on designated areas of nature conservation Flooding issues
- Ability of infrastructure requirements to be adequately met
- Impact on ecology
- Impact of land contamination, noise and other disturbance
- Agricultural land quality
- Impact on visual amenity including the visibility and character of the site and surrounding area
- The potential for the site to be adequately screened
- Access to the road network
- Distance to GP surgeries, schools, dentists, hospitals, shops and community facilities
- Proximity to other residential properties
- Potential for the proposal to utilise previously developed land
- Safe access to and from the site for vehicles and pedestrians
- Site topography
- Suitable size
- Availability of the site (including impact on the existing uses on the site)
- Deliverability of the site and associated infrastructure requirements

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

Which site are you responding to?

(e.g. GT04 Land at Harbury Lane/Fosse Way)

GT04 at Harbury Lane / Fosse Way

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.

This site, being on the boundary of Warwick and Stratford Council Areas, is supposedly having access to Harbury School (at present full) and Bishops Itchington Schools (having a few places) whereas Whitnash has more schools (with places in at least two) - distances between the site are similar but Whitnash has not selected for the schooling of the children. The same goes for all other amenities, doctors, shops etc. (Harbury / Bishops Itchington has a full capacity of patients. There seems to be a dispute as to the credibility and viability of the initial report for the Selection of Sites. Also where is the data for the numbers of travellers that need new sites - we have not been given the information

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Part B - Commenting on the Gypsy and Traveller Preferred Sites

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

Sheet 2 of 2

If you have objected to a Preferred Option site, is there another site (green or amber) from the Alternative Sites that you would support instead? Give your reasons for preferring this site?

As there are other under-occupied traveller sites in Warwickshire what is the need for more, larger sites

As M.P.s are checking the validity, credibility of the need for traveller permanent sites why is there the rush to get the ^{new} sites established before this is verified.

No where have numbers of travellers requiring permanent sites been published for this area - so is there a need.

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: