

Gypsy and Traveller Preferred Options Sites Response Form 2014

For Official Use Only
Ref: 11526
Rep. Ref.

Please use this form if you wish to comment on the Gypsy and Traveller Preferred Options Sites.

If you are commenting on multiple sites 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 consultation documents have 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

MR

First Name

MARK

Last Name

BETKER.

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 future consultations?

About You: Gender

Ethnic Origin

Age

Where did you hear about this consultation e.g. radio, newspaper, word of mouth, exhibitions?

WORD OF MOUTH

Part B - Commenting on the Gypsy and Traveller Preferred Sites

If you are commenting on multiple sites you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation

Sheet 1 of 2

The policy in the Draft Local Plan will list the criteria by which Gypsy and Traveller sites will be judged for suitability and sustainability. These are the criteria:

- Impact on the green belt
- Impact on Landscape character
- Impact on heritage assets and the settings of heritage assets
- Impact on designated areas of nature conservation Flooding issues
- Ability of infrastructure requirements to be adequately met
- Impact on ecology
- Impact of land contamination, noise and other disturbance
- Agricultural land quality
- Impact on visual amenity including the visibility and character of the site and surrounding area
- The potential for the site to be adequately screened
- Access to the road network
- Distance to GP surgeries, schools, dentists, hospitals, shops and community facilities
- Proximity to other residential properties
- Potential for the proposal to utilise previously developed land
- Safe access to and from the site for vehicles and pedestrians
- Site topography
- Suitable size
- Availability of the site (including impact on the existing uses on the site)
- Deliverability of the site and associated infrastructure requirements

Please give your views about site suitability below with reference to this list of criteria.

Which site are you responding to? *GT19 land off B'ham Rd, Budbrooke, Warwick*
(e.g. GT04 Land at Harbury Lane/Fosse Way)

What is the nature of your representation? Support Object Comment

Please set out full details of your objection or representation of support with reference to the criteria above.

*Reference to: Proposed Gypsy and Traveller Preferred Site GT19
Land adjacent Shell Petrol Filling Station, Birmingham Road,
Budbrooke, Warwick.*

*Please see attached completed document stating objections
based upon list of criteria listed in Local Plan.*

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Part B - Commenting on the Gypsy and Traveller Preferred Sites

If you are commenting on multiple sites you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation

Sheet _____ of _____

If you have objected to a Preferred Option site, is there another site (green or amber) from the Alternative Sites that you would support instead? Give your reasons for preferring this site?

Do you have any other suggestions for land within this district that you think would be suitable for use as a Gypsy and Traveller site, bearing in mind the criteria for site identification? If so, please give the location and the land owner's details below:

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

GT19 Land Adjacent Shell Petrol Filling Station, B'ham Rd
Budbrooke, Warwick

- ① The proposed site is located within the green belt.
- ② The site will have an adverse effect upon the landscape and is out of keeping with the surrounding area.
- ③ The location of this proposed site, on a main gateway approach into Warwick by both road and canal and will be detrimental to tourism for Hatton Flight and Warwick town centre.
- ④ There is high levels of sensitive nature conservation in the immediate area, supported by British Waterways.
- ⑤ The proposed site is well below the surrounding ground levels and prone to flooding.
- ⑥ There is inadequate service infrastructure to support the proposed site.
- ⑦ There will be a detrimental effect upon local ecology.
- ⑧ The land on this site could revert to quality agricultural stock easily.
- ⑨ Without additional new infrastructure there is a danger of contamination to the proposed site and surrounding area, plus increased noise from manoeuvring vehicles.
- ⑩ The proposed site will have a severe detrimental visual effect upon this tourist area and gateway into Warwick.
- ⑪ The site is located well below the surrounding ground level, will be viewed from both road and canal making screening difficult and probably futile.
- ⑫ Access to the site is dangerous, with several serious and fatal accidents having occurred along this stretch of road.

- ⑬ The site location lacks suitable local shops, available medical and school facilities and regular public transport facilities.
- ⑭ The proposed site is isolated from other residential properties and completely out of character.
- ⑮ The land is privately owned, a compulsory purchase order would be required to secure this site.
- ⑯ The proposed site is located on a busy main commuter route into Warwick, is sandwiched between road and canal thus being dangerous for both children and adults.
- ⑰ The proposed site is on a prime tourist route and would have a devastating effect upon the local economy.
- ⑱ The site is too small for turning vehicles and not fit for purpose.
- ⑲ The proposed site is privately owned and not readily available, the potential additional costs required to enable suitability for this site, does not equate to the number of proposed sites gained and therefore not cost effective.