



3700

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

24th July 2012

Dear Sir

WDC LOCAL PLAN – PREFERRED OPTIONS MAY 2012

I have examined the Local Plan Preferred Options and wish to make the following objections.

PO1

The Report of [the] Public Consultation dated December 2011 shows that 53% (para 16.3 sample household survey) favoured Scenario One as the growth option.

The response in the general questionnaire was that 58% considered that Scenario 1 would be best for the District.

Scenario One is defined in the March 2011 WDC paper "Helping Shape the District" as "Scenario 1: An average of 250 new homes and 4 hectares of land for businesses each year".

PO1 bases the Preferred Options on 555 homes per year and is not in accord with the result of the consultation.

The Preferred Options are therefore based on a false premise and are therefore fatally flawed.

PO3

The level of growth is excessive and will create infrastructure, traffic, education, health and environmental problems. None of these effects would occur if the scale of growth is cut to the Scenario One level.

Specifically the gross incursion in to prime agricultural land south of Warwick (Site 3 south of Gallows Hill and west of Europa Way) would be avoided.

In Barford, where I am resident, provision of 100 extra homes is much too large for the village to absorb and will generate excessive traffic, especially on the Barford by-pass T junctions, and cannot be supported by the existing education facilities.

My understanding is that the foul sewer from Barford to Warwick does not have capacity for a development of this size.

Modest infill in Barford in accordance with the Barford Village Design Statement (approved 2009) is appropriate and will not damage the cohesive nature of the village or its architecture if the infill development is architecturally sympathetic.

PO4

The development of Site 3, south of Gallows Hill and west of Europa Way, would represent a large incursion in to the countryside, would exacerbate the traffic congestion (stationary queuing traffic every morning in term time), is an example of urban sprawl in its worst form and would wreck the last rural entrance to Warwick and in particular the approach to Warwick Castle and The River Avon. One of the finest sights in England.

Allowing the development of this land, indeed it would appear encouraging that, would be an act of desecration for which Warwick District Council would be nationally reviled.

PO5

The provision of affordable housing should be proportionate to the requirements of the areas in which it is placed.

This will satisfy local demand but inhibit migration of sections of the population from one area to another. That migration would cause more traffic to be generated, as people go to work, and would put more pressure on heavily used facilities such as schools.

My comments apply particularly to rural infill.

PO9

The December 2011 Report of [the] Public Consultation correctly (para 6.12) draws attention to the need to stop further out of town development and (para 6.14) provide more in town parking, which I believe should preferably be free up to two hours.

The existing WDC policy of allowing out of town retail and promoting a new large retail development behind the top of Parade needs to be reversed.

There are ample empty shops in Royal Leamington Spa to satisfy demand.

Royal Leamington Spa should not attempt to compete with Solihull, Milton Keynes or London. Its attraction is its architecture and range of small shops. More like York than Solihull!

PO10

The historic environment must be protected and WDC is best placed to enforce the necessary controls.

That includes protecting the approaches to Warwick and Warwick Castle.

PO14

Permitting urban sprawl will lead to increased traffic and more commuting. This is the exact opposite of what is required.

PO16

The Green Belt is there to protect the countryside and stop urban sprawl resulting in merging urban areas.


It is there to prevent local authorities approving development in those areas.

The green belt should not be changed.


PO18

WDC should stop approving development (housing, offices, retail, gravel extraction) on the flood plain. Accordingly I support the statement at PO18.

Yours faithfully

A black rectangular redaction box covering the signature of the sender.A black rectangular redaction box covering a line of text, likely a name or title.

Copy to;

A large black rectangular redaction box covering the list of recipients for the copy.