LOCALPLAN

helpingshapethedistrict



Revised Development Strategy Response Form 2013

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	Dr	led state tables of the
First Name	Michael	A ST Phones Standard Standard
Last Name	Michael Metcafe	
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		
About You: Gender		
Ethnic Origin		

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	

Which part of the document are you responding to?	Creneral
Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)	4
Map (e.g. Proposed Development Sites – District Wide)	4
What is the nature of your representation?	Support Object

Both proposed development and the list of possible gypsy and traveller sites are too heavily consentrated towards the south of the District, especially in the area immediately to the south of Warrick and Leanington. At the level suggested, this would destroy the current nature of the historic town of Warrick and place ununtariable demands on the surrounding infastructure, especially as warrich and bearington would become conduits for greatly niceoused toffic movements between the proposed messed estates and employment to the north.

The unbalanced rateur of the Plan seems to aime four two basic assumptions. The first is the scale of development assumed to be required to pass a 'soundress' test. This is being contested elsewhere (notably by Bishop's Tachbrook Parish Council) to I wou't repeat the detailed arguments here. Nonetheless it seems clear to me that such a severe loading on the currently

		_
For Official Use Only		
Ref:	Rep. Ref.	

Part B - Commenting on the Revised Development Strategy

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the docum	nent, you will need to complete a separate sheet for eac	h
representation		

Sheet 2 of 2		
Which part of the document are you responding to?		Nexa en civera marchila-
Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)		
Map (e.g. Proposed Development Sites – District Wide)		
What is the nature of your representation?	Support	Object
Please set out full details of your objection or representation of supportion of supportion (use a separate sheet if nec		ase set out what changes
pay to meet a perceived requirement to of population influx into the District.	deconned	o high a price to
The second apparent reason for the		
Plan is the retuctance to encroach on the of the District. Although to do so would	green bett k	and in the north
of the District. Although to do so would	dearly be	underirable, it
seems likely itat the north could take a	a larger who	we of the increase
in population without transquessing the ger		
of the Warrick shire towns from Birmin		
particular, the existence of grean bett		
adaquate justification for essentially sest	ricture the	search for
gypey and traveller sites to the routh		inct.
model - mg/s / 2 mg/s / Lamping S . This bip is of the page of the		

For Official	Use	Only
--------------	-----	------