

Preferred Options Response Form

2012

For Official Use Only	
Ref:	7443
Rep. Ref.	

Please use this form if you wish to support or object to the Preferred Options version of the new Local Plan.

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document 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 plan has been made available for members of the public. You can also respond online using the LDF Consultation System, visit: www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan

Part A – Personal Data

	1. Personal details	2. Agent's Details (if applicable)
Title	Mrs	
First Name	Ann	
Last Name	Harvey	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1	10 Drayton Court	
Address Line 2	Woodloes Park	
Address Line 3	Warwick	
Address Line 4	Warks	
Postcode	CV34 5RG	
Telephone Number	[REDACTED]	
Email address	[REDACTED]	
Would you like to be made aware of future consultations on the new Local Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
About you:	[REDACTED]	
Ethnicity	[REDACTED]	
Age	[REDACTED]	

Part B – Commenting on the Preferred Options

Sheet 1 of 7

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation.

Which document are you responding to? e.g. Preferred Options (Booklet) Preferred Options (Full Version)

Preferred Options (Booklet)

Which part of the document are you responding to? Preferred Option Box (PO1)

PO1

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

Map (e.g. Preferred Development Sites – Whole District)

Please set out details of your objection or representation of support. If objecting, please set out what changes could be made to resolve your objection. (Use a separate sheet if necessary).

What is the nature of your representation?

Support Object

You state that the the preferred option level of growth is to build 555 houses a year until 2029, plus more on windfall sites. I appreciate that some new homes may be required, but I would like to challenge these figures.

Over the past 30 years, in Warwickshire and in particular Warwick itself, the population has increased more than the national average

On the Warwickshire County Council website – (Warwickshire.gov.uk/observatory/observatorywcc.insf), the 2001 census findings were that -

Over the 20 years between 1981 and 2001, there was a 6% increase in Warwickshire's population compared with only 1.6 regionally and 4.9% in England and Wales. Furthermore, the population of Warwick increased by 9.4% between 1981 and 2001. The latest available figures show that in 2001 the population of Warwick district was 125,931, and had reached 135,700 by mid 2008, (which was an increase of 7.75%).

There have been huge estates built on Woodloes Park, Warwick Gates and Chase Meadow. Surely then, it could be argued that over the past 30 years, the Warwick area has already expanded by more than has been required, justifying a lower target to be set for the next 17 years. Warwick is a small historic town of international importance, and is being swamped by housing developments. The town centre is small, with very few shops; Kenilworth has a smaller population, and yet has far more shops. People already have to travel to Leamington or Coventry if they want to buy things that cannot be bought at the out-of-town supermarket developments, adding to the traffic and pollution.

I understand that Cheltenham, also a historic town, took a stand against rampant development, and was indeed supported by the government, so it isn't true to say that submitting a plan for a lower level of development would necessarily be rejected.

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Part B – Commenting on the Preferred Options

Sheet 2 of 7

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation.

Which document are you responding to? e.g. Preferred Options (Booklet) Preferred Options (Full Version)

Preferred Options (Booklet)

Which part of the document are you responding to?
Preferred Option Box (PO1)

PO3

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

Map (e.g. Preferred Development Sites – Whole District)

Preferred Development Sites –
Whole District

Please set out details of your objection or representation of support. If objecting, please set out what changes could be made to resolve your objection. (Use a separate sheet if necessary).

What is the nature of your representation?

Support Object

Some time ago, as part of the Regional Strategy, residents were consulted about preferred areas of growth. We were part of this, and like the majority of people who responded, chose the option favouring leaving Green Belt intact. However this preference is not reflected in the Preferred Options booklet, and the democratic opinion of the electorate seems to have been ignored. What purpose is there in a consultation, if no one takes notice of the results?

I object most strongly to the use of Green Belt sites for development. Government policy is that only in exceptional circumstances should the Green Belt be breached. There are large swathes of land south of Warwick that fall in the white shaded areas outside the Green Belt, so I fail to see how there are "exceptional circumstances." I also fully support using brownfield sites.

Why not develop villages such as Barford and especially Bishop's Tachbrook, which are 2 villages in the white shaded area, and which have good access to the M40. If they were enlarged sufficiently to support more infrastructure with shops and a supermarket, the residents would be able to do their weekly shopping there and not travel to the Warwick and Leamington supermarkets, thus reducing traffic to these towns. Neither village currently has shops. Bishop's Tachbrook in particular is sufficiently distant from Leamington/Warwick to allow for expansion yet remaining separate from them and with its own identity. It could become a town similar to Wellesbourne (population about 5691) which has twice the population of Bishop's Tachbrook (population about 2,514.)

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Part B – Commenting on the Preferred Options

Sheet 3 of 7

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation.

Which document are you responding to? e.g. Preferred Options (Booklet) Preferred Options (Full Version)

Preferred Options (Booklet)

Which part of the document are you responding to?
Preferred Option Box (PO1)

PO4

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

Map (e.g. Preferred Development Sites – Whole District)

Please set out details of your objection or representation of support. If objecting, please set out what changes could be made to resolve your objection. (Use a separate sheet if necessary).

What is the nature of your representation?

Support Object

I am dismayed to read that one of your preferred options is for 180 houses to be built on land at Loes Farm, (location 9), for the following reasons:

1. It is greenbelt land. Government policy is that it should not be built on except in exceptional circumstances. I do not believe that there are exceptional circumstances – see comments I made in PO3
2. The lane is part of The Millennium Way, set up to enable people to enjoy the countryside and the views.
3. Warwick is generally flat, and it is on the only hill in Warwick. Hundreds of people every week walk along it with their families, ride their bikes, or exercise their dogs enjoying the countryside and the views towards Old Milverton. Many of these people are not Woodloes residents; there are ramblers, and visitors from other parts of the county. If houses are built there, what would be the point walking there? No one wants to look at the backs of houses.
4. Woodloes Park is already a vast estate out of keeping with a small historic town. Building at Loes Farm would form an annexe to this already large development, and have no character of its own. Much of the site is near the A46 By-pass and would probably require expensive sound barriers, similar to that erected in other developments adjoining the By-pass.
5. Access is dangerous. We were told that access to Loes Farm would likely be from Primrose Hill by means of a junction near Woodloes Ave North. Primrose Hill is a dangerous road in spite of a 30mph limit, and has had fatalities in the past. The police speed cameras are based at the very place where the access would be, so the police evidently think that this location is where people are likely to be speeding. There are frequent accidents a little further down Primrose Hill when motorists coming off the roundabout omit to cancel indicators and collide with people turning out of Woodloes Ave South. Residents of a Loes Farm site would undoubtedly have 1 or 2 cars per household like everyone else, adding to the danger. Additional cars would add to the peak hour traffic jams into Warwick, which often stretch from the Spinney Hill roundabout as far as St Johns.
6. The biodiversity of this site is important. In 2008, the Warwickshire County Museum Habitat Biodiversity Assessment advised that the site was unfavourable for housing development, and recommended that it should be left as a green buffer zone, because it had many important features:

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Part B – Commenting on the Preferred Options

Sheet 4 of 7

PO4 continued

There are at least 13 ancient trees, some being oaks over 100 years old, supporting over 40 species of birds (including 2 species of owl, green woodpeckers, great spotted woodpeckers, and sparrowhawk which I haven't seen anywhere else in Warwick) at least 2 species of bat (which are a protected species), moths, butterflies and other insects. The roots of such large trees extend for many yards, and both the trees and the houses would be put at risk if they were built too close to each other. The Museum survey advised that there should be a 50 meter buffer zone around each tree and woodland area . Much of the hedgerow dates back to the 1700s, and supports a wide diversity of species. The Museum advised that a buffer zone should also be left alongside these hedgerows.

There is an ancient ridge and furrow system in an L-shape covering around 50% of the area.

There are colonies of unusual yellow meadow ants, ponds for newts, numerous species of grasses, a colony of native bluebells (which are becoming endangered by the spread of the Spanish type), and evidence of badgers.

Housing would destroy much of this.

Would you really overturn this verdict for the sake of 180 houses? That number of houses is just a small fraction of the total houses you plan to build over the next 17 years, but this valuable biodiversity would be lost for ever.

Have you considered purchasing this site for the enjoyment of everyone, as part of the Coventry Road historic area?(see comments I made in PO 11.) It could be made into an nature area for picnics, walking and could generally enrich this part of the town. We don't have a park on this side of town, and would be an asset to the area.

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Part B – Commenting on the Preferred Options

Sheet 5 of 7

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation.

Which document are you responding to? e.g. Preferred Options (Booklet) Preferred Options (Full Version)

Preferred Options (Booklet)

Which part of the document are you responding to? Preferred Option Box (PO1)

PO11

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

Map (e.g. Preferred Development Sites – Whole District)

Please set out details of your objection or representation of support. If objecting, please set out what changes could be made to resolve your objection. (Use a separate sheet if necessary).

What is the nature of your representation?

Support

Object

Warwick is a picturesque small historic town with many buildings of international importance. Tourists from all over the world come and enjoy the attractive landscape and leafy approaches along the Banbury Road, and also past the Saxon Mill area on the Coventry Road. Other approaches to the town are now less appealing due to development. English Heritage have indentified the Coventry Rd area between Leek Wootton and the Spinney Hill roundabout as a site of special historical interest. The Saxon Mill is in private ownership, and appears to be thriving, but the important Guy's Cliffe House area has derelict gardens, and was ravaged by fire some years ago. The historic monument Gaveston's Cross and Gaveston Wood near Leek Wootton seem rather neglected. Furthermore, if houses are built at the top of the only hill in the town at Loes Farm, the approach to Warwick will be spoilt, as they will be very visible from the Coventry Road and out of character with the area of historic significance.

Surely it would be better to make a feature of this important historic area, and possibly open it up to create a valuable amenity for people to enjoy

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Part B – Commenting on the Preferred Options

Sheet 6 of 4

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation.

Which document are you responding to? e.g. Preferred Options (Booklet) Preferred Options (Full Version)

Preferred Options (Booklet)

Which part of the document are you responding to? Preferred Option Box (PO1)

PO15

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

Map (e.g. Preferred Development Sites – Whole District)

Please set out details of your objection or representation of support. If objecting, please set out what changes could be made to resolve your objection. (Use a separate sheet if necessary).

What is the nature of your representation?

Support Object

The aims *The loss of the green site at Loes Farm*

You state in PO15 that you want to “improve our green infrastructure” and will “make sure that quality open space is provided” and will “avoid impact on existing biodiversity to make a positive contribution to the quality of the natural and historic environment” “for public enjoyment.” I fully support these aims.

However, I wish to point out that building 180 houses on the site at Loes Farm will actually deprive the public of enjoying a green space that they already have. Yet out of the total number of houses you plan to build, this parcel of land would contribute only a small fraction, and to destroy it would result in the loss of a very valuable asset to our town.

Woodloes Lane is part of The Millennium Way, set up to enable people to enjoy the countryside and the views.

Warwick is generally flat with no views, and Loes Farm is on the only hill in Warwick. Hundreds of people every week walk along the lane with their families, ride their bikes, or exercise their dogs, enjoying the countryside and the views towards Old Milverton. Many of these people are not Woodloes residents; there are ramblers, and visitors from other parts of the county. If houses are built there, what would be the point walking there? No one wants to look at houses.

The biodiversity of this site is important, and worth preserving. In 2008 Warwickshire County Museum Habitat Biodiversity Assessment advised that the site was unfavourable for housing development, because it had many important features:

There are at least 13 ancient trees, some being oaks over 100 years old, supporting over 40 species of birds (including 2 species of owl, green woodpeckers, great spotted woodpeckers, and sparrowhawk, which I haven't seen anywhere else in Warwick), at least 2 species of bat (which are a protected species), moths, butterflies and other insects. There are ancient hedgerows dating back to the 1700s. There are unusual species of ants, ponds for newts, numerous species of grasses, a colony of native bluebells (which are becoming endangered because of the spread of the Spanish type.)

There is also an ancient ridge and furrow system in a L-shaped area covering 50% of the site.

Have you considered purchasing this site for the enjoyment of everyone, as part of the Coventry Road historic area? (see comments I made in PO 11.) It could be made into a natural wildlife area for picnics, walking and could generally enrich this part of the town. We don't have a green area of any size on this side of town, and it would be an asset to the area.

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Part B – Commenting on the Preferred Options

Sheet 1 of 7

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation.

Which document are you responding to? e.g. Preferred Options (Booklet) Preferred Options (Full Version)

Preferred Options (Booklet)

Which part of the document are you responding to? Preferred Option Box (PO1)

PO16

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

Map (e.g. Preferred Development Sites – Whole District)

Development Sites – (Urban fringe)

Please set out details of your objection or representation of support. If objecting, please set out what changes could be made to resolve your objection. (Use a separate sheet if necessary).

What is the nature of your representation?

Support Object

Some time ago, as part of the Regional Strategy, residents were consulted about preferred areas of growth. We were part of this, and like the majority of people who responded, chose the option favouring leaving Green Belt intact.. However this preference is not reflected in this Preferred Options booklet, and the democratic opinion of the elctorate seems to have been ignored. What purpose is there in a consultation, if no one takes notice of the results?

I object most strongly to the use of Green Belt sites for development. Government policy is that only in exceptional circumstances should the Green Belt be breached. There are large swathes of land south of Warwick that fall in the white shaded areas outside the Green Belt , so I fail to see how there are "exceptional circumstances." I also fully support using brownfield sites.

Why not develop villages such as Barford and especially Bishop's Tachbrook, which are 2 villages in the white shaded area, and which have good access to the M40. If they were enlarged sufficiently to support more infrastructure with shops and a supermarket, the residents would be able to do their weekly shopping there and not travel to the Warwick and Leamington supermarkets, thus reducing traffic to these towns. Neither village currently has shops. Bishop's Tachbrook in particular is sufficiently distant from Leamington/Warwick to allow for expansion yet remaining separate from them and with its own identity. It could become a town similar to Wellesbourne (population about 5691) which has twice the population of Bishop's Tachbrook (population about 2,514.)

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.