

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

26<sup>th</sup> June 2014

Dear Sirs

**Re: Consultation Response, Warwick Local Plan Pre Submission Draft, Hatton Station**

I am instructed by The Rosconn Group of Union House, 7-9 Union Street, Stratford Upon Avon to make representations to the Local Plan pre submission draft consultation. Rosconn have made previous representations to the plan via the consultation on village housing options and settlement boundaries. Those representations still stand.

Our concern is in relation to housing strategy adopted for the villages. We consider the policy in relation to limited infilling in Green belt Villages to be too restrictive and inflexible.

In the early stages of consultation there was the option to allow schemes, which were supported by the Parish Council or where there was local support for it. We believe this should still be included, as it would allow villages to respond to their local needs as those needs change.

Furthermore having looked at the villages where infill development is allowed we have concluded there is only limited opportunity within these. This is due in part to the wording of the policy which allows for development providing "*the development comprises the infilling of a small gap fronting the public highway between an otherwise largely uninterrupted built up frontage, which is visible as part of the street scene.*" By restricting development to those sites which front onto a highway the opportunity for new development is vastly reduced. We would ask more flexibility in the policy.

By restricting development to such an extent, we believe the opportunity has been missed to allow these villages and the services within to remain viable. Without a critical mass local bus and rail services, but to mention a few, will be at continued risk of closure or having services cut.

Turning now to specific villages we cannot understand the justification to include certain villages over others in terms of allowing growth. Hatton Station for example has a train station offering people an alternative means of travel to the car



tel: [REDACTED]  
mobile: [REDACTED]  
email: [REDACTED]

but has been over looked in favour of villages which offer no alternative means of transport and where having a couple of shops carries greater weighting than offering a choice of transportation.

We dispute the Village Site Appraisal Matrix with specific reference to the sites in Cubbington. Site 3 and 4, which my client has promoted, have been disregarded on the basis of access and landscape. Additional information was submitted in the previous consultation on village housing options in relation to both highways and landscaping. We have demonstrated that we can achieve access to the site however this appears to have been given little weight in the assessment.

It is noted that the boundary of sites 1 and 2 has been extended in order to bring the site up to a field boundary, which will help reduce its impact. The site should be considered on its own merits rather than manipulated to make it work. Sites 3 and 4 are well screened from wider views and would only require some strengthening of the boundaries rather than significant planting to screen development as is the case with sites 1 and 2. Sites 1 and 2 will have a harsh development edge due to lack of existing natural screening, this is not the case with sites 3 and 4.

Sites 1 and 2 consist of allotments and green fields, with little screening and open views of the site from the roads and agriculture fields surrounding the site. Sites 3 and 4 consist of mainly previously developed land comprising of an equestrian centre, allotments and also existing dwelling. The redevelopment of this joint parcel would allow for the allotments to not only stay but to be enhanced and would not involve development of open green belt land. We would seek to have the allotments as 'Statutory Allotments' via a Planning Condition/S.106, providing a social benefit to the removal of the land from the greenbelt. Currently the allotments are non statutory.

We believe that the wrong conclusion has been reached in allocating sites 1 and 2 and ask that this be reexamined, taking fully on board the highway and landscaping information that was previously submitted.

We ask that you take on board the comments made in this representation. Should you require any additional information please do not hesitate to contact us.

Yours Faithfully

Donna Savage  
BSc Hons, Dip TP, MRTPI



tel:   
mobile:   
email: 