

Please use this form if you wish to support or object to the Local Plan - Revised Development Strategy.

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document 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 plan has 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 | MS | |
| First Name | HELEN | |
| Last Name | WHITER | |
| Job Title (where relevant) | RETIRED | |
| 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 | | s No |
| About You: Gender | | |
| Ethnic Origin | | |
| Age | | 35 - 44 |
| | | |
| Where did you hear about this con | ere did you hear about this con | |
| Bin hanger | | |

Part B - Commenting on the Revised Development Strategy

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation

| hich part of the document are you respondin | g to? | Sites Er | Gypsies + | Trar |
|--|---------------------|----------------|---------------------|--------|
| aragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if i | relevant) | | | |
| 1ap (e.g. Proposed Development Sites – Distric | t Wide) | | | |
| What is the nature of your representation? | | Support Object | | |
| lease set out full details of your objection or re | | | ase set out what ch | nanges |
| ould be made to resolve your objection (Use o | a separate sheet in | necessory). | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |
| | | | | |

Rep. Ref.

SITES FOR GYPSIES AND TRAVELLERS

I lived for a number of years in Cambridgeshire, which has a very high number of Travellers (1% of the population), so I am used to living near Traveller sites. The councils put efforts into liaising, and much of this work is very productive and successful. But they also take action when appropriate.

Section 7.3 of your Local Plan document sets out criteria for the selection of sites and these seem entirely appropriate. If you apply the criteria, a number of the proposed sites would not be suitable. For example, site 20, which is the site nearest to me. There is no convenient access to a GP surgery or school. (The latter is critical if we want successful integration.) Access would not be safe and the site could spoil the view on the approach to Warwick. This is also Greenbelt Land (see below)*.

If you apply the 7.3 criteria, a small number of sites will be suitable. The challenge is the additional criterion in 7.4 second bullet point ie 'promotes peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community', since some local communities are anxious about having the sites nearby. I believe that you should apply the 7.3 criteria and then consider which communities are most likely to assimilate a Traveller site more successfully, so that there is less danger of marginalisation and more of an opportunity for the Traveller community and non-Travellers to come across each other on a regular basis in their daily lives. Hackney and Newham have both recently established sites within the existing settled community and, so far, this is working well. However, these areas already have a more diverse population than the local area, which helps integration. Hence the need to take account of the characteristics of the nearest communities.

*However, if it is acceptable to identify the Greenbelt Land near Sherbourne, because the owner has offered it, then that disregards the reason for having Greenbelt. And if that can be done for this site, then the areas to the north of the district should also be considered. This would avoid all the sites being clustered in the south of the district.

Alternatively, integrating sites within the new housing developments is a very positive option, since integration from the beginning of a new community is likely to be more successful.

Local residents have clearly seen and heard about, and possibly experienced, the worst aspects of some Traveller sites. There are, of course, some successful settled traveller sites and these are generally the result of the Travellers' own behaviour and attitudes and effective approaches from the wider community.

So, whilst there are no guarantees that pro-active planning will ensure a Traveller site causes no problems, it is important that all the relevant local councils, agencies and institutions work together to ensure 'the best chance of success'. The key staff who are leading initiatives need to have a genuinely positive attitude and desire to make things work. Focussing on the young people will be critical, since they will form the future Traveller population. So we need planning for successful integration into local schools with traveller children feeling welcomed by staff and other children

(racism from other children is a key cause for failure to attend), as well as youth work with teenagers. It is then easier to engage parents and in some areas there are examples of travellers becoming school governors and volunteers.

Some might say that there should be no extra cost or effort, but it would be worth it if successful.

Section 7.3 of your Local Plan document sets out criteria for the selection of sites and these seem entirely appropriate. If you apply the criteria, a number of the proposed sites would not be suitable. For example, site 20, which is the site nearest to me. There is no convenient access to a QP surgery or school. (The latter is critical if we want successful integration process would not be safe and the site could spoil the view on the approach to Murwick. This is also Greenbelt Land (see selow)*

If you apply the 7.3 oritena, a small number of sites will be suitable. The challenge is the additional oriterion in 7.4 second bullet point is 'promotes peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community' since some local communities are anxious about having the sites nearby. I believe that you should apply the 7.3 oriteria and then consister which communities are most likely to apply the 7.3 oriteria and then consister which communities are most likely to apply the 7.3 oriteria and then consister which communities are most likely to apply the 7.3 oriteria and then consister which communities are most likely to marginalisation and more successfully, so that there is less danger of fraveller site more successfully, so that there is less danger of analyment fravellers to come across each other on a regular basis in their daily lives. Hackney and Newham have both recently established sites within the existing settled becommunity and, so far, this to work or which neares areas already have a nore diverse population than the local area which neares the strategies to come across each other on a regular basis in their daily lives. Hackney for more diverse population than the local area which nelps integration. Hence the need becommunity and, so far, this to work or area which nelps integration. Hence the need become diverse population than the local area which nelps integration. Hence the need be raise account of the characteristics of the nearest communities.

However, if it is acceptable to identify the chreshbelt Land near Shabqume, because the owner has offered in the Directorenerids the reason for having Greenbelt, And if that can be done nor the owner then the areas to the north of the distoct should also be considered in this would avoid all the sites being clustered in the south of the district.

Alternatively, integrating sites within the new housing developments is a very positive option, since integration from the beginning of a new community is likely to be more successful.

.ocal residents have clearly seen and need anout and possibly experienced, the vorst aspects of some Travelier which I three are, of course, some successful settled raveller sites and these are generally life result of the Travellers' own behaviour and attitudes and effective approaches how, five vider community.

So, whilst there are no guarantees thit per arrive planning will ensure a Travellet afte causes no problems, it is impolibility in the relevant local councils, agencies and institutions work together to ensure 'this best chance of success'. The key staff who are leading initiatives need to have a genuinely positive attitude and desire to make things work. Focussing on the young people will be critical, since they will form the future Traveller population. So we need planning for successful integration into local schools with traveller children feeling welcomed by staff and other children

Part B - Commenting on the Revised Development Strategy

-

Ref:

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document, you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation

| /hich part of the doc | ument are you respondir | ng to? | |
|--|--|--------------------|---|
| www.www.hov/ll | eading / Subheading (if | rolovant | |
| aragraph nomber / n | edding 7 Sobhedding (m | relevant | |
| lap (e.g. Proposed De | evelopment Sites – Distric | ct Wide) | |
| What is the nature of your representation? | | Support Object | |
| | | | |
| | ails of your objection or re olve your objection (use o | | pport. If objecting, please set out what changes necessary) |
| Joid De made to rest | Sive your objection (ose t | a separate sheet i | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | 2.00000000000 | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | |
| | | | avial Batelity wing Centre |
| | | | |
| | | | |