

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

20th Jan 2014

Dear Sirs

**Re: Consultation Response, Village Housing Options and Settlement Boundaries
Land at Antrobus Close, Hatton Station**

I am instructed by The Rosconn Group of Union House, 7-9 Union Street, Stratford Upon Avon to make representations to the draft village housing options and settlement boundaries consultation. Rosconn have the option to promote what is referred to as site 1 at Hatton Station, land to the rear of Antrobus Close.

We welcome the strategy adopted of allowing development within the villages and welcome the inclusion of site 1 in the plan.

We consider that site 1 has many positives. The site is previously developed land with an existing access, which is suitable for new development. The site is located close to the train station, providing a choice of transport for any new residents. Indeed new development would help keep the station viable.

The site allows for a greater mix of housing as opposed to site 2 and would appear as an extension to the existing cul-de-sac. The site would not involve the development of a Greenfield site unlike the other two sites at Hatton Station.

In terms of ecology, we are satisfied there would be no ecological issues in developing the site. An ecology report has already been submitted and concludes

“Taking all the evidence into account, the proposed development of land off Antrobus Close is unlikely to impact on wildlife and will not lead to a significant loss of habitat in the area.”

“If a population of Slow-worms, or other reptiles, is found on the site (although none were found during the scoping survey) then there is flexibility built into the site plan to accommodate the species.”



The Coach House
45B Rother Street
Stratford-upon-Avon
Warwickshire CV37 6LT

tel: 01789 293452
mobile: 07808 367061
email: donna@dspplanning.org

Registered Number: 06084002

Some residents have raised the issue of slow worms being present on the site however the ecology report states there is unlikely to be slow worms on site with more attractive habitats being available near by along the railway embankment. Grass snakes and the common lizard are also protected species but were found to be absent from the site.

An assessment of foul drainage has been done to ensure a suitable solution can be found without increasing the pressure on existing systems. This report has already been submitted and concludes there is a workable drainage solution. The conclusion states:

“Given the location of the site, existing ground levels and proximity to the watercourse it would appear that the option of treating the domestic effluent as opposed to discharging it into the local sewer appears feasible and practical. Additionally some preliminary discussions with sewage treatment specialists would suggest that such options are readily available and with appropriate consents they might be incorporated as part of the design.”

This site affords the Local Authority the opportunity to have defensible boundaries around the site with the railway line on one side and the brook at the rear.

Allowing the development of either of the other sites would result in non-defensible green belt boundaries being created especially at the Old Station Road site (site 2). The Del Site (site 3) would in fact break the defensible boundary, which is Old Station Road and would represent development encroaching into the open countryside. Site 1 represents an option for development that would visually integrate with the built up area of the village without encroaching into open countryside.

We have had a noise assessment carried out for both sites 1 and site 2 which is attached to this representation. Site 1 is within noise category B and site 2 within category C. The advice on where development should be directed is set out below.

NEC C states that ‘Planning permission should not normally be granted. Where it is considered that permission should be given, for example because there are no alternative quieter sites available, conditions should be imposed to ensure a commensurate level of protection against noise.’

NEC B states that ‘Noise should be taken into account when determining planning applications and, where appropriate, conditions imposed to ensure an adequate level of protection against noise’.



It can only be concluded that development would be inappropriate on site 2 given the availability of site 1.

We have been in contact with Orbit housing and attach a letter from them, which states they would not normally carry out a development in NEC C. The development of site 2 is therefore likely to prohibit the deliverability of affordable housing.

Finally we would ask that careful consideration be given to numbers, given the increased population figures and changing demographics together with the need to ensure that local services, such as the train service and post office survive into the future. If too low a number is proposed then their long-term viability could be compromised.

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

The Coach House
45B Rother Street
Stratford-upon-Avon
Warwickshire CV37 6LT

tel: 01789 293452
mobile: 07808 367061
email: donna@dsplanning.org

Registered Number: 06084002