

9999

| |
|--------------|
| WDC PLANNING |
| Ref |
| Officer |
| 29 JUL 2013 |
| SCANNED |
| CC CR PD MA |
| PRE GEN DIS |

25.7.13

Re: Bishops Tachbrook Local Plan -
Revised Development Strategy.

Dear Sir,

We strongly object to the proposals in the above RDS and urge the Planning Department to reconsider on the following grounds ~

The proposed number of new houses to be built, 12,300, is way in excess of the 5400 homes required (see Ray Bullen's paper July 2012, updated 2013). This is backed by the 2012 Strategic Housing Market Assessment which reported that 'Warwick District has a very good jobs/home balance' and with unemployment at only 1.7% it is difficult to understand why this report is being ignored.

The Local Plan RDS also proposes new housing around villages; In the case of Bishops Tachbrook 100-150 houses. This is despite our housing need survey identifying the need for only 14 homes - 10 'affordable' and 4 'market'. The proposal therefore appears to lack research and integrity. Village life would be diminished with such a large number of new houses and, together with the

other extensive development proposed south of Harbury Lane, would envelop us all in 'urban sprawl', thus destroying village character and charm, and put enormous and unacceptable strain on infrastructure eg. road congestion in both town and village, already acute in parts of Warwick; our local schools, amenities, transport etc.

The loss of beautiful countryside south of Leamington Spa due to development has been considerable in recent years, particularly the construction of Warwick Gates. Two observations worthy of note are as follows:

- Warwick District Council's landscape consultant, Richard Morrison (landscape Area Statement in 2009) referred to the land south of Gallows Hill and said 'this study area should not be considered for urban extension and the rural character should be safeguarded from development'. This begs the question - why is the District proposing to ignore and act against this recommendation?
- The Planning Inspector who reviewed the current local plan in 2006 stated that Woodside Farm 'should not be built on now or in the future'. Again, why is this advice now being ignored?

The impact on the environment would be huge if the proposed development goes ahead at anything even approaching

the suggested volume. Wildlife, an
inherent and enormously important
and valuable part of our countryside
has already been greatly affected by
previous development in our local area.
It would be utterly tragic and
irresponsible if we fail to protect this
natural habitat and so destroy the
eco-systems within it. They are an
important part of our English, county and
village heritage and, as such, we have a
duty to preserve them, particularly as so
much land, including agricultural land,
hedgerows and mature trees has already
been lost.

We repeat our vehement objection to
the proposed building plans and would
strongly urge you to reconsider.

Yours faithfully,

