

1. Legal compliance: This a major proposed modification to the original local plan which, because it had been rejected as unsound, has now been pinpointed as ‘the solution’ solely as a result of the Inspector’s reaction to the original plan. There needs to be a proper rationale based on current evidence for the dramatic change in position in a matter of months. The need to respond to the Inspector’s comments has necessitated a ‘rushed’ and incomplete evaluation and contradictory evidential support. The documentation is now so complex that it is difficult for any member of the public to have grappled with it in the time between discovery of this amended proposal (February 2016) and closure of the consultation (22<sup>nd</sup> April 2016) – and there appears to be missing justification other than general references to notions of ‘collaboration’ and a ‘co-ordinated Masterplan’ which I cannot find here. My concern relates to Coventry and the democratic deficit here. This is a Warwickshire plan that will seriously and negatively impact on Coventry and Coventry rate payers have no means (other than this process – not widely publicised) to input the rush to respond to the Inspector’s initial objections.
2. Unsound: There is no proper joined up evaluation of the consequences of building a sizeable number of houses (initially 425) on farm land (appears to be a working farm – fields ploughed and seeded etc) other than in relation to Warwickshire and its infrastructure. Coventry appears not to have conducted such an evaluation.

Westwood Heath is basically a road – with no infrastructure - and in the 7 years I have lived here I’ve seen about 5 buses in total. There are no facilities. This is the countryside. Westwood Heath Road joins Cromwell Lane by means of a double junction which seems to be the only possible junction given the limited space (i.e. a roundabout would seem impossible without house demolition). I understand that 200 plus additional housing is also planned for Cromwell Lane. Given that both roads are used for major volumes of traffic to the University and surrounding areas (avoiding Kenilworth) but also travelling into Coventry – Tile Hill and the massive new Bannerbrook estate in Coventry, it is obvious that the evaluation stops at the point where it addresses the consequences for Warwickshire. There is a vague reference to a link road to the A46 (presumably Crackley Lane to Kenilworth) but no details have been supplied and that seems essential for the Warwickshire side. However, there is no mention of the traffic consequences for the University traffic and general traffic at the Coventry side (i.e. Henry Parkes Road and roundabout is already problematic for Coventry with University traffic and Business Park traffic). Please bear in mind that we are probably talking on average 1.5 cars per household (given other infrastructure failings) so that will mean an additional 600 cars in the area when traffic jams of at least a mile to Cromwell Lane are common place in rush hour. I cannot get home as it is! This is the worst part of my journey and I work in central Birmingham!

There is a reference to the train line via Leamington but that is not the issue for Coventry or Westwood Heath. The issue in terms of rail is already acute. Government policy encourages park and ride but Tile Hill station (servicing 2 major businesses on Westwood Heath Road – EON and Network Rail) is already so full very early in the morning that it is impossible to get a space after 7.45 am (sometimes earlier) and there are parking issues in the surrounding area. The car park has been enlarged twice since I have lived here and has no further capacity. This is why I drive.



The infrastructure is a serious issue – and the impacts are largely on the Coventry side whereas the evaluation relates to Warwickshire (because that was the basis on which Warwickshire was proceeding. Indeed, the Warwickshire evaluation recognises the serious infrastructure issues based only on the Warwickshire side of the line. Anything that is done in this area has the potential to impact considerably on the 3<sup>rd</sup> business on Westwood Heath Road, namely the University – which is similar to a small town.

I would strongly urge the inspector to reject this proposed modification and undertake a current evaluation of infrastructure in the Westwood Heath area, particularly the Coventry and University impacts. This has to be the current infrastructure since nothing can be done quickly, possibly at all (or I cannot see how Henry Parkes can be extended or more parking created at Tile Hill) to alleviate the issues on the Coventry side (and indeed as far as I can see there are no detailed plans to alleviate infrastructure deficits on the Warwickshire side either, i.e. no planning for a road – through the University, around the University – where exactly?, no plans for traffic congestion in Cromwell Lane to Kenilworth and through Burton Green lanes to Balsall Common). I would add that the report (and reasons given in Table 4.19) are impossible for a member of the general public to decipher and seem to me to be designed to hide the fact that the infrastructure is a problem but the bigger problem is now the inspector's need to see some joined-up thinking at the borders of both councils.

HS2 is cited as a reason in favour of this proposal. This is backwards. HS2 will lead only to considerable increases in the volume of traffic on Westwood Heath Road and Cromwell Lane. There is no stop on that rail line in this area, or near it. In fact, HS2 is liable to lead to increased traffic volumes in the Westwood Heath/Cromwell Lane area with the singular purpose of using the park and ride at Tile Hill station to get to Birmingham International station, where a stop is proposed, - and hence to London and London airports.

I moved to this area having previously lived on two massive new estates. It was not possible to exit either estate in the mornings without enduring a 20-minute queue to leave the estate. (Bannerbrook has caused similar issues for Coventry which I experienced when seeking to avoid issues with the University developments by travelling through Tile Hill to try and get to the A45).

#### *Conclusion*

It makes no sense to build the proposed number of houses (400 plus – and that is just stage 1 for Westwood Heath– would cause significant issues in this area) at this location given (i) existing infrastructure problems (as evidenced with rush hour traffic jams and problems at Tile Hill station and the surrounding areas, and Station Road in Tile Hill is impassable at times); (ii) the position of the University and its infrastructure which impacts directly on the residents of Westwood Heath Road; (iii) the usual lack of joined up thinking, e.g. Coventry is planning to close a nearby secondary school. The infrastructure issues in this area are well-known. No-one lives here unless they have multiple cars and are prepared for difficult road conditions. The proposal is neither realistic nor sustainable. This proposal has been rushed and should not be agreed without proper consultation with the Westwood Heath community and a full and thorough evaluation of infrastructure by BOTH Councils. Contrary to what is stated in the Plan (can be accommodated

‘without undue adverse impacts on local amenity’) the opposite is the case. Serious adverse impacts are inevitable given that the necessary infrastructure changes on the Coventry side do not seem possible (and I would suggest that much of the traffic is heading to Coventry and Birmingham) - and infrastructure on the Warwickshire side (to get to Leamington etc – less used I would suggest) will not predate the development. I see no evidence presented here which substantiates the claim that the farmland site at Westwood Heath can accommodate 425 houses, a massive number.

