

To WDC, Development Policy Manager

My husband and I have already objected to the proposed GT02 site, and all previous reasons for objecting stand.

Today I watched ITV Central news cover the story of GT02 as an alternative site and as a result I am taking this opportunity to voice our objections against the possibility of GT02 being an alternative to the preferred sites.

Having looked at some of the supposed evidence we have many concerns regarding the sourcing of some of the evidence and lack of fairness in the entire process. The Sustainability Appraisal is flawed as previously pointed out by many. The GTAA is flawed as Salford University did not carry out these assessments in an objective way. The landscape Sensitivity and Ecological & Geological Study has been ignored and the presented summary of sites and allocation of Green/Amber/Red ratings to the sites is totally unbalanced.

All underlined, italic, bold writing below comes directly from the various documents just mentioned.

All references to GTO2 site are in relation to the revised western part of the previous GTO2 site, as outlined in the WDC Gypsy and Traveller preferred options brochure.

We start with The Landscape Sensitivity and Ecological & Geological Study report that was prepared in November 2013 for the New Local Plan. In the section marked **LCP/Zone RS_03** on page 35, it shows the landscape sensitivity for the broader area of the GT02 site. This in fact scores the highest levels AGAINST development at GT02.

Landscape Sensitivity to housing development High - medium

This proposed site cannot be integrated into the landscape without harming the character of the surrounding area.

The zone could accommodate a small amount of development along Offchurch Lane or adjacent to the existing settlement edge, providing it didn't encroach beyond the first field in order to avoid ribbon development along the A425.

The zone referred to here, includes the GT02 as it sits along the Fosse Way. It wasn't deemed suitable for housing development, so cannot be considered appropriate for a proposed Gypsy & Traveller site

Landscape sensitivity to commercial development High

Because of the openness and topography of the landscape this zone is considered unsuitable for commercial development.

A traveller's site cannot be called residential as the site would have a mixed residential and commercial existence because travellers work from their sites.

The next set of points raised are some of WDC quoted reasons why some sites have actually been excluded, when in fact the same arguments can be given for GT02 to be excluded also.

(GT17 and GT18) **This could cause issues with tailbacks onto the A46 dual carriageway.**

The Fosse Way already experiences tailbacks at busy times of day, it is a high crash risk road near to the roundabout and traffic is a major factor in our ability to exit the driveway onto The Fosse Way where we live. Any change or temporary imposed restriction to the road use has a major impact on the traffic and causes tailbacks very quickly especially during rush hour traffic. I have witnessed tailbacks caused by Travellers' horse and carts, and the poor driving of some of the cars stuck in these tailbacks.

(GT17 and GT18) **There are no footpaths to access any amenities or facilities at this point**

This should be a major consideration to exclude GT02.

(GT03) **This use is a successful business**

What about the successful business that exists at the Warwickshire Exhibition Centre (WEC), why has GT02 site not been ruled out as too sensitive also. The business will be directly affected by a site placed here; the Centre could not continue to operate safely and securely.

Compulsory Purchase orders are an unacceptable way forward; to forcibly take one man's land and give to another, and allow much greater use and development to the new owner who has done nothing to deserve preferential treatment in gaining that piece of land, is surely not lawful. Social cohesion is not possible under these circumstances.

(GT07) **Site is too sensitive in relation to the successful breeding of Guide Dogs;**

It is incredulous that such a proposal was ever considered at the Guide Dogs location and just as incredulous to consider it by the WEC. What about the breeding of the alpacas and rare Pigs, currently bred and living in harmony with their environment. Why are they not an important consideration?

It is alarmingly obvious that the assessment makes conflicting comments relating to each site.

(GT17 and GT18) **Noise from the A46 would be intolerable for residential use, particularly caravans which are less well insulated than conventional housing.**

(GT20) **Noise from the surrounding major road intersection/M40/A46 junction would be intolerable for residential use, particularly caravans which are less well insulated than conventional housing.**

with noise a likely issue to caravan dwellers in particular

Noise from Fosse Way - Despite this being a big issue stated for other sites, you failed to mention it as a major consideration at GT02, yet when excluding some sites you make a big deal of the noise factor. Here at Cedar Tree Farm, we have installed double glazing, but the noise from the Fosse Way can be quite considerable, especially when the bikers are out – and the lady who lived adjacent to the Fosse Way road (recently moved away) had triple glazing installed due to the noise from the Fosse Way, which she stated distressed her greatly.

(GT20) **Site is remote from all amenities and facilities and access extremely difficult across such major roads.** The Fosse way is a major link road and as such is incredibly busy, and where you

propose to put the GT02 site, has numerous signs and even a 'safety' camera; it's exceptionally busy at rush hours and I know personally of a motor bike rider killed and a number of dogs, because it is a dangerous fast moving road; adding caravans, horses, dogs, children into the mix cannot be sensibly considered.

(GTalt04) **This land has been considered for ordinary market housing, but proved to be unsuitable and is therefore not suitable for caravans**

The Landscape Sensitivity, Ecological & Geological Study report states GT02 area along the Fosse way is not suitable for residential or commercial development.

Interestingly, another site was ruled out because of the following; (GTalt13) **has no previous built development and is in open countryside away from facilities.** GT02 is able to make the same arguments, but no mention in the brochure of this point

(GTalt09) **a location which Gypsies and Travellers wish to avoid.**

How about GT02 is a location which existing local residents wish the Gypsies and Travellers to avoid;

As I understand it, approximately 700 local residents objected to GT02 as a proposed site, but no consideration has been given to the number of objections. Instead the strength of feeling against this has been ignored and even termed 'generic', because of the format used to object. This format was agreed as acceptable by WDC before it was used, so the objections shouldn't be downgraded, and the number of residential objections should count.

And here's a rather strange statement of support, found in the preferred options for sites brochure, summary of alternative sites page 46 re: GT02 **The Fosse Way is a popular route with the travelling community and the site is ideally located for this reason** – There is nothing objective or relating to sustainability or evidenced in this statement. How can you label the site as ideally located, of course it isn't, it is already owned and not up for grabs; there's nothing ideal about CPO.

On the other hand, this route is particularly popular with bikers; very fast moving, extremely vulnerable individuals exposed to extreme injury and death to a much greater degree than car users. The bike rider, who died along that very stretch of the Fosse Way, was killed as a result of a vehicle pulling out on him and another dragging him along the road. It was a dreadful accident and another fatality or severe injury would be a terrible price to pay for any proposed site.

This next section comes from your 'site by site assessment and I have just picked a few to mention, in relation to GT02:

9. How visible and open in character is the site? - NO ANSWER GIVEN, should say **VERY**

10. Can the site be visually screened adequately? - NO ANSWER GIVEN, should say **NO**

the GT02 proposed site is part of a beautiful setting, which is a pleasure to drive along and admire from all directions of the roads accessing the roundabout. It is at times very highly visible and due to it being in a valley position, could not be adequately screened. There was a piece on ITV Central news today, which showed just how beautiful this area is, and how open and overlooked it is from

some vantage points. You shouldn't be allowed to destroy this beautiful area with unsuitable development. The required lighting alone would ruin the look of the area. I am in fact surprised that travellers would want to be positioned here as they would be overlooked from many angles.

11. Is the site close to other residential property? ANSWER **Single dwelling immediately adjacent to southern boundary.** If you look at the map you include within the preferred sites brochure, page 47, you'll find that the site is close to quite a number of other residential properties, not just a single dwelling. Again this represents the flaws and inaccuracies within your own material, your assessments and your (supposed) rationale

18. Availability - Businesses restrict use on eastern part of site. Only with compulsory purchase

There is no availability on the western part of the site either. It is owned and good agricultural land

19. Deliverability - Not without compulsory purchase. This really isn't an acceptable way forward.

In assessing the Green/Amber/Red ratings I would like to add a few more comments to the list to object to GTO2, which would take the rating from Green to RED. All comments have been taken either directly from other site assessments which were given a red rating, or are presented as a result of other sites comments:

Road noise from The Fosse Way, especially fast moving bikes

Access issues, especially in respect of fast moving bikes, and vast volumes of traffic

Sensitivity of existing use, current owner runs a successful business

High quality landscape

Impact concerns on wildlife – Parlour Spinney

Impact concerns on animal breeding – alpacas & rare pigs

Not desirable in terms of potential impact on water environment – Grand Union Canal

Highly visible being set lower than surrounding roads and/or fields – Valley positioning

Remote from services and facilities and no pedestrian access

This part of The Fosse Way unsuitable to serve caravans

Already assessed for residential use and found unsuitable

The Settled community is being highly discriminated against; there is no equality in this process

Travellers have been given an unfair advantage over land

Uncertainty over impact on the existing businesses including WEC, farming and animal breeding

Not deliverable; the landowner is not prepared to sell this site, so CPO would be necessary

Cannot promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community

Owners wish to retain site for the safety and security of existing business

Current owners have not indicated any intention to relocate

Very open and conspicuous viewed from local residents surrounding properties

Not Green Belt but also not previously developed land

I realise that I have been repetitive in my objection, but it's been easier for me to write this way. To reiterate the points that were already made previously, represented by so very many objections and which should have made the GTO2 site an excluded site. Also to question the evidence, assessment processes and reliability of the information gathered regarding needs and numbers of pitches.

Yours faithfully

A solid black rectangular box used to redact the signature of the sender.