

WDC PLANNING
Ref
Officer
10 JAN 2014
SCANNED
CC CR PE NEW
PRE GEN DIS



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

8 Jan 2014

11380

Dear Sirs,

Re: Gladman Developments, Proposal to build in Radford Semele, next to St Nicholas Church.

I wish to object in the strongest terms to this proposal.

There are many reasons why I feel that this development is inappropriate, and *none* of them are because I object to development in/of Radford Semele – the village needs to move forwards, and there are many ways in which new housing could be introduced to the village which would not detract from the existing nature of the village.

The Gladman proposals appear to be very aggressive, very forceful, somewhat over-ambitious, and generally poorly communicated – the impression is that Gladman are attempting to “rail-road” their way in to the development of the village, introducing a high-density, “not in keeping with the surroundings” development, without proper consultation or appropriate consideration of future impact.

In no small part, the fact that the Warwick District Council suggest Radford Semele requires (only) 100 homes, and Gladman are offering 30% more, is clear indication to me that they are being bullish.

I am sure that it would be very easy to sit in a Head-Office in Cheshire and not take appropriate heed of the real impact of a development taking place a hundred miles away – however, life should not just be about meeting a politicians housing plan, there is a need for all of us to act in a professional, sympathetic and considerate manner in the implementation of such a plan.

My biggest concern with Gladman’s proposal is the sheer volume of dwelling being proposed – the correspondence received from Gladman suggests that they are planning to provide approximately 130 “homes”. Please compare this to the existing local population density.

By my reckoning, (using Google Maps, and Gladman’s own plan), there are 42 houses immediately adjacent to the proposed development – and they appear to occupy approximately the same area as the proposed development, further, the Gladman proposal includes a significant Public Open Space which I have not removed in this comparison.

I believe that the Gladman proposal equates to a development that has more than 3 "Gladman homes" for every existing home in the area.

This cannot be considered to be comparable or sympathetic.

After the above objection to the Gladman proposal, the obvious objections rank:

- The character and feel of the village is defined by the openness created by the space surrounding the Church – Gladman's proposal would destroy this. (even if they stick to their plan for Public Open Space, which I cynically believe would miraculously metamorphose into property by the time the development were complete).
- Traffic flow is already compromised in the village – to build where Gladman propose would significantly worsen the situation.
- There are many listed properties in the immediate area, which deserve better than to be crowded out by a mass-built, densely packed, modern housing estate.
- An alternative proposal exists for (I believe) a better development; it appears to be a slightly smaller site, proposes "about 60 homes" (far more in keeping with the existing property density), has better potential for vehicle access, has less opportunity to impact upon existing rain-water drainage routes, and appears to have better potential for sustainable development in the future.

My over-riding question is: Why do Warwick District Council appear to be promoting the Gladman proposal?

Please do not permit the first developer to rush in and spoil the village.

Please permit details of properly mature plans for all sites to be compared by a fair, locally supported, democratic, open and honest decision, and let the best proceed (not restricted to a single site, either!).

To date, decisions seem to have been taken by Warwick District Council without fair liaison or discussion with even Radford Semele Parish Council, let alone fair representation to the people of Radford Semele.

Yours faithfully,

A solid black rectangular box redacting the signature of Richard Buckingham.

Richard Buckingham