

HOUSING DEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS FOR NORTON LINDSEY

1. I have a number of objections to the proposals some of which are covered by the responses to the PO booklet attached. However I would add the following by way of expansion or clarification.

2. The proposed site has, I understand, already been rejected as unsuitable for development on at least two occasions.

3. The site is deeply sloping and entirely unsuitable for those with disabilities and the elderly.

4. The access issues are challenging as outlined below and in light of the narrow access roads.

5. New housing, by definition, attracts young families with children.

6. Despite being a village in the heart of the countryside there is a significant lack of public amenity space. The public amenity space that exists consists of

[i] a sports field with severely limited access during most weekends and often summer evenings due to sporting events and

[ii] a very small play area for young children.

The consequence is that there is less public amenity area in the village already than exists in towns such as Warwick.

7. The village has no amenities such as a shop, post office, bank, GP service etc., and it seems unlikely that any such facilities would be attracted by the development proposals.

8. The costs associated with residing in this village are significantly higher than in some other areas in terms of travel, rates and no access to natural gas supplies.

9. In practical terms public transport is non - existent as evidenced by the voucher scheme for senior citizens to pay for transport [an addition to their 'free passes'].
10. The lack of public transport will inevitably mean a significant increase in traffic levels with the associated increased risk of accidents and levels of pollution. Additional public transport is unlikely to be attracted by the proposed size of the development. Further the value of public transport is debatable having regard to the narrow village roads, lack of pavement areas and the existence of traffic blackspots.
11. There are at least two accident 'blackspots' in the village namely the junction of Gannaway Road/Henley Road and Curlieu Road and the junction of New Road and Warwick Road. The latter site being immediately adjacent to the proposed development site. In addition the road in front of the village school is already an area fraught with problems during the morning and mid afternoon.
12. There are a significant number of ancient and valuable trees dividing the 'fields' and the area is home to a variety of wildlife.
13. The 'fields' are adjacent to the greater part of the 'Norton Lindsey Conservation Area'.
14. The erection of a substantial number of housing units in a relatively small area and in a very small village will impact seriously on the aesthetics of the conservation area and the village generally.
15. The mere fact of putting a substantial number of housing units of similar age, design and plot size in an area such as the 'fields' will have the effect of creating a latter day 'housing ghetto' given that the existing village and particularly the 'Conservation Area' currently represents a relatively pleasing mix of architectural housing types and ages on mixed size plots.

16. Such a development will necessitate the destruction of many old trees [what price tree preservation policy!].

17. The lack of public amenity space will lead to children being forced to play on the streets with the associated risks.

PART B - COMMENTING ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS.

ALL COMMENTS REFER TO PREFERRED OPTIONS SUMMARY BOOKLET

PO1 - OBJECT

The need for more housing is self evidently necessary however I believe insufficient consideration has been given to the Norton Lindsey proposals which largely or entirely concern land previously concluded to be unsuitable for development, by the local authority, on one or two previous occasions. Consequently it is difficult to understand why it is now considered suitable

PART B - COMMENTING ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS.

ALL COMMENTS REFER TO PREFERRED OPTIONS SUMMARY BOOKLET

PO2 - OBJECT

It seems inconceivable that any adequate infrastructure could be provided for Norton Lindsey even with the benefit of a levy.

There is no natural gas supply.

There is very limited public amenity area - one sports field and a small play area. The use of the sports field is very limited due to its use as both a cricket and football ground.

There is little or no public transport and very narrow roads without adequate pavements making the traversing of the area by public transport very difficult.

There is no local GP service.

There is only one [primary] school already fully utilised.

PART B - COMMENTING ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS.

ALL COMMENTS REFER TO PREFERRED OPTIONS SUMMARY BOOKLET

PO3 - OBJECT

Services in and about Norton Lindsey are few and far between.

No shops.

No leisure facilities.

One [very small] pub.

Almost no employment.

PART B - COMMENTING ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS.

ALL COMMENTS REFER TO PREFERRED OPTIONS SUMMARY BOOKLET

PO4 - OBJECT

There is little or no likelihood that employment opportunities would become available in Norton Lindsey.

Likewise little or no space for community facilities .

PART B - COMMENTING ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS.

ALL COMMENTS REFER TO PREFERRED OPTIONS SUMMARY BOOKLET

PO5 - OBJECT

Development on the Norton Lindsey site is likely to be expensive in view of the access challenges and the steep sloping nature of the site.

PART B - COMMENTING ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS.

ALL COMMENTS REFER TO PREFERRED OPTIONS SUMMARY BOOKLET

PO6 - OBJECT

The site is entirely unsuited to people with disabilities or older people having regard to the steep sloping nature of the site. In fact a less suitable site is difficult to visualise.

PART B - COMMENTING ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS.

ALL COMMENTS REFER TO PREFERRED OPTIONS SUMMARY BOOKLET

PO10 - OBJECT

The Norton Lindsey proposals contribute nothing to designing for safe communities and good access to services nor will they reduce carbon emissions.

In light of:-

the narrow roads and accident black spots [at the junction of Curlieu Lane and Henley Road and adjacent to the proposed development site at the junction of New Road and Warwick Road] and,

the lack of public amenity space

The proposals will make the community less safe.

The absence of shops, banks, post office and GP service will increase carbon emissions.

PART B - COMMENTING ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS.

ALL COMMENTS REFER TO PREFERRED OPTIONS SUMMARY BOOKLET

PO12- OBJECT

The documents concedes that transport is the '*biggest contributor to carbon emissions*'

The Norton Lindsey proposals will therefore increase such emissions as outlined in the previous submissions.

PART B - COMMENTING ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS.

ALL COMMENTS REFER TO PREFERRED OPTIONS SUMMARY BOOKLET

PO13 - OBJECT

It is unlikely if not certain that the proposals will make any contribution to the expressed desire to *'deliver inclusive, safe and healthy communities by controlling the location of [this] development'*.

I have made clear in my previous objections that the area lacks many basic facilities, is fraught with traffic problems, lacks public transport and would undoubtedly increase carbon emissions.

PART B - COMMENTING ON THE PREFERRED OPTIONS.

ALL COMMENTS REFER TO PREFERRED OPTIONS SUMMARY BOOKLET

PO14 - OBJECT

There is little public transport in the village and the attraction of any more is unlikely on economic grounds and would in any event itself present significant traffic problems and accident risks having regard to the nature of the village and its roads.

Additional public transport would add to carbon emissions in addition to those which inevitably added by further private vehicles, delivery vehicles and the like.