

## Gypsy and Traveller Site Options Response Form 2013

For Official Use Only

Ref: 9714

Rep. Ref.

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

**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](http://www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan)

### Part A - Personal Details

	1. Personal Details	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	MRS.	
First Name	CATHERINE	
Last Name	WENMAN.	
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 of future consultations on Gypsy Traveller sites?		
About You: Gender		
Ethnic Origin		
Age		
Where did you hear about this consultation e.g. radio, newspaper, word of mouth, exhibitions, bin hanger?		

# Part B - Commenting on the Gypsy and Traveller Site Options

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

Sheet  of

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:

- Convenient access to a GP surgery, school and public transport;
- Avoiding areas with a high risk of flooding;
- Safe access to the road network and provision for parking, turning and servicing on site;
- Avoiding areas where there is the potential for noise and other disturbance;
- Provision of utilities (running water, toilet facilities, waste disposal, etc);
- Avoiding areas where there could be adverse impact on important features of the natural and historic environment; and,
- Sites which can be integrated into the landscape without harming the character of the area.
- Promotes peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community;
- Avoids placing undue pressure on local infrastructure and services;
- Reflects the extent to which traditional lifestyles (whereby some travellers live and work from the same location thereby omitting many travel to work journeys) can contribute to sustainability.

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

Which site are you responding to?

(e.g. GT01 - Land adj. to the Cobalt Centre, Siskin Drive)

GT05, 6, 9, 10, 12, 15, 16, 17, 18, 20

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.

SEE ATTACHED

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Site #	Comments
5	<p>Vehicular access to this site is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and egress to and from this site to the highways network would not be safe.</p> <p>This site is not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors' surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car, which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.</p> <p>Development of this site would lead to an unacceptable loss of farmland and rural employment, rendering the isolated sites (e.g. site 12) totally unviable.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a material negative impact on the capacity of Barford St. Peter's School, especially given the village's status as a 'Secondary Service Village' and its likely requirement to provide 70-90 new dwellings during the Plan period. Development would also reduce the availability for long standing residents to obtain places for their children.</p> <p>The WDC have disregarded the Rural Area Policies, especially RAPs 1 (New Housing), 6 (New Employment), 10 (Safeguarding Rural Roads) and 15 (Camping and caravan Sites). In all respects the sites fail to meet the policy criteria to allow any form of development.</p> <p>The development of this site could not take place without a material adverse effect on the landscape and could not be integrated without harming the visual amenity of the site.</p> <p>This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p> <p>WDC should have identified 'brownfield' sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.</p> <p>WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctor's surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.</p> <p>Ecology and Environment – the site has ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.</p> <p>WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a 'buffer' to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not 'swallowed up' by Warwick and Leamington over time.</p> <p><b>Summary</b> Car access into and out of this site is onto A roads and is not safe. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities. Development of this site would result in losing important and valuable farmland. Barford St. Peter's School does not have the capacity to accommodate the additional children that would need a school place. The site is not for sale and not available for development.</p>
6	<p>This site is situated on historic landfills, which though closed may still have the potential to release greenhouse gases and are unsuitable for any form of permanent habitation and</p>

Site #	Comments
	<p>occupation.</p> <p>This site is close to the Asps, which Warwick District Council decided that should remain open due to there value as a backdrop to the historic Warwick Castle Park. The Revised Development Strategy, therefore, excludes the Asps and should also exclude the adjoining sites for the same reason.</p> <p>There have been a number of reported wild deer sightings on this land and there is a population of deer that roam freely across the Castle grounds and onto this site and beyond.</p> <p>Vehicular access to this site is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and egress to and from this site to the highways network would not be safe.</p> <p>This site is not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors' surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car, which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.</p> <p>Development of this site would lead to an unacceptable loss of farmland and rural employment, rendering the isolated sites (e.g. site 12) totally unviable.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a material negative impact on the capacity of Barford St. Peter's School, especially given the village's status as a 'Secondary Service Village' and its likely requirement to provide 70-90 new dwellings during the Plan period. Development would also reduce the availability for long standing residents to obtain places for their children.</p> <p>The WDC have disregarded the Rural Area Policies, especially RAPs 1 (New Housing), 6 (New Employment), 10 (Safeguarding Rural Roads) and 15 (Camping and caravan Sites). In all respects the sites fail to meet the policy criteria to allow any form of development.</p> <p>The development of this site could not take place without a material adverse effect on the landscape and could not be integrated without harming the visual amenity of the site.</p> <p>This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p> <p>WDC should have identified 'brownfield' sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.</p> <p>WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctor's surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.</p> <p>Ecology and Environment – the site has ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.</p> <p>WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a 'buffer' to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle</p>

Site #	Comments
	<p>Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not 'swallowed up' by Warwick and Leamington over time.</p> <p><b>Summary</b>            Car access into and out of this site is onto A roads and is not safe. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities. Development of this site would result in losing important and valuable farmland. Barford St. Peter's School does not have the capacity to accommodate the additional children that would need a school place. The site is not for sale and not available for development. This site is an ex landfill site and is not suitable for development and / or occupation.</p>
9	<p>This site is situated on historic landfills, which though closed may still have the potential to release greenhouse gases and are unsuitable for any form of permanent habitation and occupation.</p> <p>This site is close to the Asps, which Warwick District Council decided that should remain open due to there value as a backdrop to the historic Warwick Castle Park. The Revised Development Strategy, therefore, excludes the Asps and should also exclude the adjoining sites for the same reason.</p> <p>There have been a number of reported wild deer sightings on this land and there is a population of deer that roam freely across the Castle grounds and onto this site and beyond.</p> <p>Vehicular access to this site is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and egress to and from this site to the highways network would not be safe.</p> <p>This site is not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors' surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car, which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.</p> <p>Development of this site would lead to an unacceptable loss of farmland and rural employment, rendering the isolated sites (e.g. site 12) totally unviable.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a material negative impact on the capacity of Barford St. Peter's School, especially given the village's status as a 'Secondary Service Village' and its likely requirement to provide 70-90 new dwellings during the Plan period. Development would also reduce the availability for long standing residents to obtain places for their children.</p> <p>The WDC have disregarded the Rural Area Policies, especially RAPs 1 (New Housing), 6 (New Employment), 10 (Safeguarding Rural Roads) and 15 (Camping and caravan Sites). In all respects the sites fail to meet the policy criteria to allow any form of development.</p> <p>The development of this site could not take place without a material adverse effect on the landscape and could not be integrated without harming the visual amenity of the site.</p> <p>This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p> <p>WDC should have identified 'brownfield' sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.</p> <p>WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would</p>

Site #	Comments
	<p>ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctor's surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.</p> <p>Ecology and Environment – the site has ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.</p> <p>WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a 'buffer' to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not 'swallowed up' by Warwick and Leamington over time.</p> <p><b>Summary</b>            Car access into and out of this site is onto A roads and is not safe. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities. Development of this site would result in losing important and valuable farmland. Barford St. Peter's School does not have the capacity to accommodate the additional children that would need a school place. The site is not for sale and not available for development. This site is an ex landfill site and is not suitable for development and / or occupation.</p>
10	<p>This site is situated adjacent to historic landfills, which though closed may still have the potential to release greenhouse gases are unsuitable for any form of permanent habitation and occupation.</p> <p>Vehicular access to this site is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and egress to and from this site to the highways network would not be safe.</p> <p>This site is not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors' surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car, which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a material negative impact on the capacity of Barford St. Peter's School, especially given the village's status as a 'Secondary Service Village' and its likely requirement to provide 70-90 new dwellings during the Plan period. Development would also reduce the availability for long standing residents to obtain places for their children.</p> <p>This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p> <p>WDC should have identified 'brownfield' sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.</p> <p>WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctor's surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.</p> <p>Ecology and Environment – the site has ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.</p>

Site #	Comments
	<p>WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a 'buffer' to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not 'swallowed up' by Warwick and Leamington over time.</p> <p><b>Summary</b> Car access into and out of this site is onto A roads and is not safe. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities. Development of this site would result in losing important and valuable farmland. Barford St. Peter's School does not have the capacity to accommodate the additional children that would need a school place. The site is not for sale and not available for development. This site is an ex landfill site and is not suitable for development and / or occupation.</p>
12	<p>This site is within (part) and otherwise immediately adjacent to areas identified by the Environment Agency as having significant flood risk.</p> <p>This site has inadequate pedestrian crossing facilities for safe access into the village of Barford.</p> <p>Vehicular access to this site is from the A429 trunk road, which was constructed as a bypass to Barford. Even though it has a 60 mph speed limit there have been a significant number of accidents, including a fatality. The existing access into this site is entirely inadequate.</p> <p>Vehicular access to this site is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and egress to and from this site to the highways network would not be safe.</p> <p>This site is not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors' surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car, which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.</p> <p>Development of this site would lead to an unacceptable loss of farmland and rural employment, rendering the isolated sites (e.g. site 12) totally unviable.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a material negative impact on the capacity of Barford St. Peter's School, especially given the village's status as a 'Secondary Service Village' and its likely requirement to provide 70-90 new dwellings during the Plan period. Development would also reduce the availability for long standing residents to obtain places for their children.</p> <p>The WDC have disregarded the Rural Area Policies, especially RAPs 1 (New Housing), 6 (New Employment), 10 (Safeguarding Rural Roads) and 15 (Camping and caravan Sites). In all respects the sites fail to meet the policy criteria to allow any form of development.</p> <p>The development of this site could not take place without a material adverse effect on the landscape and could not be integrated without harming the visual amenity of the site.</p> <p>This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p> <p>WDC should have identified 'brownfield' sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.</p>

Site #	Comments
	<p>WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctor's surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.</p> <p>Ecology and Environment – the site has ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.</p> <p>WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a 'buffer' to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not 'swallowed up' by Warwick and Leamington over time.</p> <p><b>Summary</b> Car access into and out of this site is onto A roads and is not safe. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities. Development of this site would result in losing important and valuable farmland. Barford St. Peter's School does not have the capacity to accommodate the additional children that would need a school place. The site is not for sale and not available for development. There is significant risk of flooding. It is not safe to cross the A429 and access the village of Barford on foot.</p>
15	<p>Vehicular access to this site is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and egress to and from this site to the highways network would not be safe.</p> <p>This site is not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors' surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car, which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.</p> <p>This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p> <p>WDC should have identified 'brownfield' sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.</p> <p>WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctor's surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.</p> <p>Ecology and Environment – the site has ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.</p> <p>WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a 'buffer' to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not 'swallowed up' by Warwick and Leamington over time.</p>



Site #	Comments
	<p><b>Summary</b>            Car access into and out of this site is onto A roads and is not safe. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities. This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community. The site is not for sale and not available for development. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities.</p>
16	<p>This site is the flood compensation area from the Barford bypass build and contains a permanent central pond and is unsuitable for any form of development.</p> <p>This site is within (part) and otherwise immediately adjacent to areas identified by the Environment Agency as having significant flood risk.</p> <p>This site has inadequate pedestrian crossing facilities for safe access into the village of Barford.</p> <p>Vehicular access to this site is from the A429 trunk road, which was constructed as a bypass to Barford. Even though it has a 60 mph speed limit there have been a significant number of accidents, including a fatality. The existing access into this site is entirely inadequate.</p> <p>Vehicular access to this site is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and egress to and from this site to the highways network would not be safe.</p> <p>This site is not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors' surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car, which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.</p> <p>Development of this site would lead to an unacceptable loss of farmland and rural employment, rendering the isolated sites (e.g. site 12) totally unviable.</p> <p>Development of this site would have a material negative impact on the capacity of Barford St. Peter's School, especially given the village's status as a 'Secondary Service Village' and its likely requirement to provide 70-90 new dwellings during the Plan period. Development would also reduce the availability for long standing residents to obtain places for their children.</p> <p>The WDC have disregarded the Rural Area Policies, especially RAPs 1 (New Housing), 6 (New Employment), 10 (Safeguarding Rural Roads) and 15 (Camping and caravan Sites). In all respects the sites fail to meet the policy criteria to allow any form of development.</p> <p>The development of this site could not take place without a material adverse effect on the landscape and could not be integrated without harming the visual amenity of the site.</p> <p>This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p> <p>WDC should have identified 'brownfield' sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.</p> <p>WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctor's surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.</p>

Site #	Comments
	<p>Ecology and Environment – the site has ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.</p> <p>WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a ‘buffer’ to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not ‘swallowed up’ by Warwick and Leamington over time.</p> <p><b>Summary</b> Car access into and out of this site is onto A roads and is not safe. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities. Development of this site would result in losing important and valuable farmland. Barford St. Peter’s School does not have the capacity to accommodate the additional children that would need a school place. The site is not for sale and not available for development. There is significant risk of flooding. It is not safe to cross the A429 and access the village of Barford on foot.</p>
17	<p>Vehicular access to this site is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and egress to and from this site to the highways network would not be safe.</p> <p>This site is not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors’ surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car, which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.</p> <p>This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p> <p>WDC should have identified ‘brownfield’ sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.</p> <p>WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctor’s surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.</p> <p>Ecology and Environment – the site has ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.</p> <p>WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a ‘buffer’ to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not ‘swallowed up’ by Warwick and Leamington over time.</p> <p><b>Summary</b> Car access into and out of this site is onto A roads and is not safe. The site is not for sale and not available for development. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities. This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p>
18	<p>Vehicular access to this site is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and</p>

Site #	Comments
	<p>egress to and from this site to the highways network would not be safe.</p> <p>This site is not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors' surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car, which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.</p> <p>This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p> <p>WDC should have identified 'brownfield' sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.</p> <p>WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctor's surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.</p> <p>Ecology and Environment – the site has ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.</p> <p>WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a 'buffer' to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not 'swallowed up' by Warwick and Leamington over time.</p> <p><b>Summary</b> Car access into and out of this site is onto A roads and is not safe. The site is not for sale and not available for development. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities. This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p>
20	<p>This site is situated adjacent to historic landfills, which though closed may still have the potential to release greenhouse gases are unsuitable for any form of permanent habitation and occupation.</p> <p>Vehicular access to this site is from an already heavily utilised road network. Access and egress to and from this site to the highways network would not be safe.</p> <p>This site is not sustainable in terms of multi modal accessibility. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities (schools, doctors' surgeries etc) on foot or on bike via pedestrian footpaths or cycle routes, or by bus. The only means of accessibility is by car, which would place further pressure on the local highway network infrastructure and is unsustainable.</p> <p>Development of this site would lead to an unacceptable loss of farmland and rural employment, rendering the isolated sites (e.g. site 12) totally unviable.</p> <p>The WDC have disregarded the Rural Area Policies, especially RAPs 1 (New Housing), 6 (New Employment), 10 (Safeguarding Rural Roads) and 15 (Camping and caravan Sites). In all respects the sites fail to meet the policy criteria to allow any form of development.</p>

Site #	Comments
	<p>The development of this site could not take place without a material adverse effect on the landscape and could not be integrated without harming the visual amenity of the site.</p> <p>This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p> <p>WDC should have identified 'brownfield' sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington for Gypsies and Travellers. These sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would enable better integration in to the local community. Despite such sites existing, they are all being proposed for redevelopment for more valuable uses.</p> <p>WDC should be requiring Gypsy and Traveller sites are delivered within the proposed major new housing developments in Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington. This would ensure that the sites could be properly designed in a sustainable fashion and be fully integrated into a local community which will provide facilities such as a school, a doctor's surgery and shops which are accessible on foot, on bike, by bus and by car.</p> <p>Ecology and Environment – the site has ecological value and environmental issues which does not appear to have been assessed.</p> <p>WDC should consider allocating an area of land to the south of Warwick and Leamington including The Asps and Sites 5, 6, 9, 10 as Greenbelt to provide a 'buffer' to the proposed developments to the south of Warwick and Leamington and/or to extend the proposed Bishops Tachbrook Country Park as far as the Banbury Road near to Warwick Castle Park. This would ensure the villages in the south of the District retain their identity and are not 'swallowed up' by Warwick and Leamington over time.</p> <p><b>Summary</b></p> <p>Car access into and out of this site is onto A roads and is not safe. The site does not offer the ability to access local community facilities. Development of this site would result in losing important and valuable farmland. The site is not for sale and not available for development. This site is an ex landfill site and is not suitable for development and / or occupation. This site does not allow for peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community.</p>