

6116

The Development Policy
Manager
Warwick RDC.

23. 7. 2012.

re - NEW LOCAL PLAN

Dear Sir/Madam,

Once again I am joining the campaign of special pleading for the protection of the Warwickshire countryside and its beautiful landscapes. It would appear that some of the representations made in 2009 have been heeded but there are still grave concerns that the planners have not yet grasped the likely consequences of their own proposals.

In any proposed development the key is to strike the right balance between preservation and providing habitation for the young. My wife and I in 1961 benefited from the provision of a new house in a small development in which we have lived ever since. It is a peaceful and tranquil location and life has been very much in harmony with the natural world.

The new local plan can hardly be said to have got the balance right - a massive development of 10,800 new homes to be built before 2030 with an additional population of 25,500 i.e. 18% increase. This is hardly a demographic necessity in view of the fact that in the last decade the population has increased by only 12%. The WDC's own survey voted for the low growth option of 250 homes per year, a total of 4,500.

The likely consequence of this high level of growth would, I believe, be catastrophic. The vital amenity of green spaces is unlikely to escape the bulldozers and a large part will / fear disappear for ever under a carpet of asphalt and concrete. Secondly, the aesthetic value of the southern approach to Warwick would be dramatically impaired by the proposed 1600 houses along its length and the rural landscape at Woodside Farm would be blighted by the building of 250 new houses. Moreover, the traffic congestion resulting from the latter development would be acute.

The most worrying aspect of the new proposals is that one area is being asked to take 0.2% of the total housing proposed. This is manifestly unfair and must be resisted with the utmost vigour.

The planners must also be made aware of the opportunities they have missed:-

1. Brownfield sites appear to have been underused - only 480 houses out of a possible 1320 in suitable urban brownfield sites have been included in the plan (It is my understanding that there is more than enough brownfield land nationally to house everyone in the country!) Is it that developed greenfield land is more preferable?
2. Little or no consideration given to the regeneration of poorer parts of L'lon - Warwick
3. It would make good planning sense to locate some new housing in close proximity to the new Gateway employment zone. At the moment this area has not featured in the planners' deliberations
4. Small scale housing developments should be allowed in villages in the WRD such as Buttsenhall & [REDACTED]