

## **Appendix 1**

### **Report on the outcomes of Preferred Options Consultation, Land at Stratford Road, Warwick**

#### **1. Introduction**

1.1. This report has been prepared to provide a summary of the representations made in relation to the Preferred Options Consultation, Land at Stratford Road, Warwick, October – December 2014 consultation.

1.2. The outcomes from this consultation will help direct the next stage of the process to identify the sites which will be included in the Council's Draft Publication Gypsy and Traveller Sites document.

1.3. The tables in this report summarise the representations received on the potential Gypsy and Traveller site off Stratford Road, Warwick. These representations have been responded to by the Council.

1.4. Full details of the representations received in relation to this consultation are available on the Warwick District Council website at

#### **2. Consultation Representations Statistics**

2.1. The table below provides a summary of the representations received. It should be noted however that although the planning system does not place weight on the specific number of responses received, it recognises the strengths and quality of the arguments put forward and the general body of opinion.

2.2. In addition to the 700 individual representations received, the Council has received a petition submitted by 4 Warwick Councillors and signed by 326 people.

## Representation Summaries

TOPIC	COMMENT	RESPONSE
<b>Objections:</b>		
<b>General</b>		
	Considerable constraints to overcome even for business use	The full extent of the mitigation required will not be clear until further investigative works have been undertaken, however, there would be a considerable area of land made available for new business use and another area potentially available to expand that use later in the Local Plan period. The amount of money that would be generated by this sort of development would attract a levy to pay in full or partially, for new infrastructure required
	Unsuitable/unpleasant environment for residential use	The Gypsy and Caravan site would be in an area which is less prone to suffer from the noise/pollution/smells generated by the motorway and sewage works. The land is outside the Cordon Sanitaire as it is currently situated and therefore could be built without any need for work to be undertaken at the sewage works. The location is very pleasant visually being located near to the river and with views across open fields and parkland
	Why would this be considered suitable for Gypsies and Travellers if not suitable for any other residential use?	In the 2014 SHLAA the assessment for residential was 'Not suitable, due to noise from M40 to south, flood risk areas to south and east and proximity to sewage works to north.' This assessment was for all the area around Home Farm and encompassing this parcel of land. The assessment refers to all of this land and there are pockets within the whole site which could be suitable for small scale development, but not of the size of a strategic site required for the Local Plan. Subsequent environmental reports which relate

		to a smaller area of land encompassing the land currently considered for a Gypsy and Traveller site suggest that these issues are less than expected and could be mitigated against. If the site were to be taken forward to the next stage, more detailed work would be required to support this, but as it stands, the site may be suitable for residential use
	Out of character. The land straddles a transition from the urban fringe of brown field environment to an area of open agricultural land which provides an appropriate setting for the town, St Mary's Church Tower and the Castle. The aesthetics of Warwickshire Countryside should be maintained and the uncluttered view from the M40 of Warwick town centre and its Castle should be kept.	These dwellings would all be single storey and lie low in the landscape. A generous area has been suggested for additional landscaping which would provide a natural screen whilst reducing noise and pollution from the motorway. The best sites for Gypsy and Traveller use are on the edge of towns and villages where there is access to local facilities. This represents such a location
	Land represents, on a very small scale, the informal 'green belt' of the ancient hamlet of Longbridge, damage having already been done by the M40 and its junction	Whilst not wishing to reduce the more open feeling of the site with a Gypsy and Traveller site, the allocation in the Local Plan for business use rather negates any impact the Gypsy and Traveller site would have
	No money available to make the land suitable	There is still work to be done on the amount of work required to make the site acceptable if it is to go ahead. Once the costs of this have been calculated, it may be that a purchaser would find those costs make the site unviable, however, it will be for the purchasers of the land to decide if this is the case
	The Council has indicated proposed sites but has given no assurances about how they will be managed how they will ensure that those using the sites comply with terms of use	The site proposed for the use of Gypsies and Traveller will either be purchased, set up and managed by the Gypsies and Travellers themselves or by a social landlord. It is not and never has been the intention of Warwick District Council to own or manage any of these sites
	No evidence of positive impact of Traveller site	It is impossible to show evidence of impact before a site is set up and running. We have no sites in the District so no available experience

		to draw on. The positive impact for the district however is that it would go some way toward meeting the outstanding need for 31 pitches
	It is unacceptable to plan a site and hold a consultation without telling the public how the site will be accessed	Access would be decided if the site were to go forward, however, Warwickshire County Council has indicated it is satisfied with the access being taken from Stratford Road which then leads onto the Old Stratford Road and to the existing farm track
	Valuable land should not be used for a site which favours one selection of people over another	The Government has a policy which singles out the Gypsy and Traveller population and makes Local Authorities responsible for finding them suitable accommodation. Whilst this policy exists, land will have to be found for this purpose
	If they are genuine travellers then why not persuade a local farmer to rent out his field for a few weeks and then move on to another area	The sites that we are seeking are for permanent use i.e. families will stay on the site (which they may also own) in much the same way as any other family may settle permanently in a house or a mobile home park. Travellers may choose to stop travelling for a number of reasons including poor health, care for the elderly or children needing to attend school. This does not alter their background or traditions, but does mean that they need a permanent place to stay whilst maintaining their lifestyle
	Cannot believe that such a plan is being considered given the location, with a secondary school adjacent and the Warwick Gates housing development nearby	This is one of the reasons for considering this location. It is close to facilities required by the Gypsy and Traveller community. The criteria by which sites are considered include being close to such amenities
	Already, we have 2 local Gypsy & Traveller sites proposed within 3 miles of Warwick, how many Gypsy and/or Traveller site we need in the local area	The district has a need for 31 permanent pitches over a 15 year period, 25 of which are required within the first five years – two years has already passed since these figures were published but we have not provided any sites as yet. Sites should ideally be between 5 and fifteen pitches in size. Sites should be located on non- green belt

		land. This restricts greatly the area in which we can search but specifically includes land to the south of Warwick, Leamington and Whitnash
	There are other sites dedicated to travellers within a 10 mile radius of Warwick and I am keen to know what need you feel can be serviced at the proposed site that cannot be met elsewhere in the wider area?	There are no sites within Warwick District to meet the district's needs. We have worked in co-operation with adjoining district's to see if there are possibilities to site share, but these districts have their own need to meet and will require sites which are already operating and maybe more to meet that need. Warwick District requires 31 pitches just to meet its own need
	Gypsies and Travellers will not be able to afford the infrastructure required to make the site habitable	Until work is done to assess the costs involved and these have been put to the Travellers interested in living at the site, it will not be possible to comment on this
	Public transport not an issue but isn't cheap	Public transport is available and accessible and the cost is the same for everyone
	Will local tax payers be expected to incur the cost of this site by increasing council tax bills?	The Council does not intend to invest money into running these sites. Whilst some minor costs may be incurred, these will be minor and will not affect the level of council tax paid by any residents, including the Gypsy and Traveller community
	The pitches require too much land	Based on guidance set out in Circular 01/2006 a pitch size of at least 500 square metres, plus space between caravans/mobile homes of 6m minimum for fire safety, land for an access road, play space, possibly pasture for grazing horses/ponies and storage space is required. Some pitches will need to be larger, some can be smaller
	G&T community themselves ask for smaller sites not big sites as they recognise these larger sites cause issues, and friction with the community	Ideally, we would wish to see a number of small sites rather than several larger ones, however, there is no land available to us to do this without using CPO powers. The Council would only do this as a last resort as the process is unpopular, expensive and can take a long time to complete
	Commercial viability of the site called into	There would not be a commercial element to

	question	the residential part of this site since families would purchase the land for their own occupation
	Why should Gypsy Travellers get the same privileges and not pay any of their taxes?	Gypsies and Travellers living on permanent sites are required to pay their taxes and would be liable for council tax and other taxes in the same way as the settled community
	Appears a 'fait accompli' position seems to have been adopted	Clearly this is not the case. The consultation responses will be taken into account when deciding whether this site will be carried forward or not and any planning reasons given will be carefully considered together with any other information gained during the course of the consultation
	No evidence that Traveller families would want to live on any particular site	We are working closely with a number of families who are looking for sites in this district. There is interest in this site and others that we have considered
	Experience of other Traveller sites suggests Travellers turn up, get moved on and come back the following day	This may apply to illegal encampments, but not to permanent sites where families will purchase the site to live on long term or transit sites where there is a set length of time within which they are allowed to remain
	Danger to motorway drivers if waste finds its way onto the road	The site is some distance from the motorway which is elevated at this point. The Gypsy and Traveller community would be provided with refuse bins in the same way as the settled community and these would be emptied in the same way as any other resident's.
	Why do they need permanent sites paid for by the tax payer if they are 'travellers'	Travellers may choose to stop travelling for a number of reasons including poor health, care for the elderly or children needing to attend school. This does not alter their background or traditions, but does mean that they need a permanent place to stay whilst maintaining their lifestyle. The sites that we propose to provide will be purchased by the families themselves to provide their own facilities or by a social landlord who will provide amenities and then

		rent out pitches
	Severn Trent has now mentioned concerns to Council which had not been voiced before	Severn Trent and the private landowner have voiced concerns about providing land for the Gypsy and Traveller site during the consultation period. Their formal responses to the consultation could decide the fate of the site
	Has anyone asked these people where they would like to be sited?	We are working closely with a number of families who are looking for sites in this district. There is interest in this site and others that we have considered
	Proposals appear to be ok but why do proposed sites appear to be outside town areas, in the country and miles from anywhere? Why cannot sites be in towns on brown field sites , near public amenities such as doctors, hospitals, schools, etc.it would be easier for councils to provide services, collect rubbish and provide policing	Ideally sites should be located on the edge of towns or villages with facilities available. Urban sites do not suit either the Travelling community or the settled community; neither wishing to share space in close proximity.
	Concerned, as a matter of principle, that the District Council are obliged to provide sites, that the cost of the sites, including setting them up is likely to be excessive and that they may not be used,	The Government has a policy that specifically makes local authorities responsible for finding sites for the Gypsy and Traveller community. The way in which sites are paid for depends on the potential landowners. In the case of a local authority, if they are planning to own the land and rent out pitches with facilities themselves, then the cost is borne by them. If sites are provided by social landlords, then the site is paid for and facilities provided by the landlord, but the most successful sites are those that are purchased by the Gypsy and Traveller families for their own occupation and these are paid for entirely by the Gypsy and Traveller community. In each case there may also be available government grants to assist with the purchase of the land and setting up
	Dogs are kept, usually outdoors, that are aggressive to strangers and noisy	This is no different to the settled community, but dogs tend to be kept as a warning system that there are strangers around since caravans

		are less secure than bricks and mortar housing
	Main mode of transport is transit vans and pick-up trucks and parking is inadequate	Parking would be provided as part of a site, but this would be a detailed issue for a planning application. Sites should be of sufficient size to include adequate parking either within pitches or within the curtilage of the site
	Individual pitches if vacant become dumping grounds	There is no reason to think that this will be the case.
<b>Access to site</b>		
	Access is inadequate	Whilst no specific access has been promoted at this stage, it is considered that the single farm track to the land is currently inadequate and would require widening and upgrading to meet the required standard. Alternatively, a new access could be provided running parallel with this track if the landowner is agreeable to selling the land required to do so
	No details given	See above
	Single track road is unsuitable with few passing places and no viable plans for improving it or adding an alternative for emergency vehicles	See above
	The disturbance/noise from movement of large vehicles would be vastly different from the current quiet, narrow lane	Whilst there would be an increase in the number of vehicles using the access, there would only be a need to move large vehicles on an occasional basis. Once the caravans/mobile homes are in place, they would not need to be moved unless the pitch was being vacated and on a permanent site this would not be a regular occurrence
	The access road uses part of a national cycle route, and the increase volume and size of traffic on this route will seriously affect the safety of people using it	If the site were to be taken forward to the next stage then further detailed advice would be required on this particular issue, however, as can be seen from the comments of the Highways Agency below, they do not consider the number of vehicles involved to be of concern
	Would need to remove 50 mature trees to widen the access road	If the existing track were to be upgraded then this would be one possibility
	The old road is a major path for walkers and	If the site were to be taken forward to the next

	cyclists to the footbridge over the motorway	stage then further detailed advice would be required on this particular issue, however, as can be seen from the comments of the Highways Agency below, they do not consider the number of vehicles involved to be of concern
	Owner does not agree to making this access available for use to service the Gypsy and Traveller site, nor to widen the track	Noted
<b>Access from Stratford Road</b>		
	Increase in traffic	Fifteen pitches is not considered to represent a large increase in potential traffic movements. See Highways Agency comment below
	Traffic uses this road when there is a problem on the motorway and it gets very congested	This is inevitable and will happen from time to time as it does now. Fifteen pitches is not going to add greatly to the numbers of vehicles already using this road or if such a scenario occurs
	On a tight bend which has seen many accidents and has warning chevrons	Please see the comments of the Highways Agency below
	Right turn into the farm access is dangerous	Please see the comments of the Highways Agency below
	Fast moving traffic coming from motorway/A46	Please see the comments of the Highways Agency below
	Traffic queues to Longbridge roundabout at peak times	Please see the comments of the Highways Agency below
	Dangerous for large vehicles turning	Please see the comments of the Highways Agency below
	WCC has not yet advised on this issue	WCC advised informally that this access was acceptable for the number of vehicles likely to be involved
	Would increase the risk of walking and cycling along Stratford Road.	Fifteen pitches is not going to add greatly to the numbers of vehicles already using this road. Please see comments of Highways Agency below
	Tree planting has been done from the Longbridge round-about along the whole length of the Stratford Rd. up to West St; a	The provision of a Gypsy and Traveller site would not have an impact on this approach and is very unlikely to be visible from the road

	splendid approach	
	There is one pedestrian footpath	Advice does not indicate that there would be a problem
	The landscaping put in by the developers at Chase Meadow is a good first impression	The provision of a Gypsy and Traveller site would not have an impact on this approach
	Suggest that when you identify what you may consider a suitable site which fronts a main or arterial road that you first consult the highways department, by doing that you could save a lot of peoples time and money	The Highways department have been consulted both informally before the consultation and formally through the consultation process. This is common practice when carrying out a high level assessment prior to public consultation. In this case, the informal advice received was that the access would be acceptable
	Another junction will have to be added to what is already an extremely busy, bendy road adding to traffic problems	The existing junction is considered acceptable to the highway department and to the Highways Agency
	School is too far for small children to walk causing additional traffic on busy road	It is inevitable that some additional traffic will occur as a result of the Gypsy and Traveller site, however fifteen pitches is not going to add greatly to the numbers of vehicles already using this road. Please see comments of Highways Agency below
<b>Availability</b>		
	Severn Trent land is not immediately available and they do not support this plan and will not allow access over their land	It is understood that local residents received a letter stating this to be the case, however, the Council has not received any official notification which is expected through the formal consultation process and may mean that the site is no longer considered available
	CPO would fail criteria of land being immediately available and not in Council ownership	It is not necessary for the Council to own the land unless it intends to provide pitches for rent, which it does not. Although there is a need to have a five year supply of land available for this use, land is also required beyond this time and land which could potentially be available can be taken into consideration as an area of search for future use. Using CPO powers is not an ideal situation and the Council will wish to avoid taking this step except as a last resort

	CPO would be required which is uncertain, subject to a public inquiry and the timescales variable but would mean the site is not available now. The local authority must be able to demonstrate a compelling case in the public interest which is not the case for 15 families	It is not necessary for the Council to own the land unless it intends to provide pitches for rent, which it does not. Although there is a need to have a five year supply of land available for this use, land is also required beyond this time and land which could potentially be available can be taken into consideration as an area of search for future use. Using CPO powers is not an ideal situation and the Council will wish to avoid taking this step except as a last resort.
	If CPO considered, all similar sites should be brought back in for consideration	Agreed
	Unclear whether third landowner is willing to consider the Gypsy and Traveller use or make his land available	It is understood that the third landowner will be making a formal response to the consultation
<b>Sewage Treatment Works</b>		
	Smells from sewage works	The site, although not far from the sewage works, is not understood to be impacted upon in the same way as land to the west of the works. The prevailing winds carry odours predominantly to the west, therefore properties on Chase Meadow are more likely to be affected. The Cordon Sanitaire does not include the land in question currently and any work to improve the situation at the works will be beneficial here. As it stands this site could be developed without the additional improvements
	Proximity to sewage works makes it unsuitable	See above
	The claim that the effect of the smell from the sewage works can adequately be 'mitigated' by drawing a smaller circle round the works is disbelieved by residents of the nearer parts of the Chase Meadow estate. It depends which way and how strongly the wind is blowing	See above
	Locating the site next to the sewage works is against government guidelines.	See above
	Site is in 'cordon sanitaire' for a good reason	The site is not within the 'Cordon Sanitaire'.

		See above
	Severn Trent has not committed to removing the 'Cordon Sanitaire'	The site is not within the 'Cordon Sanitaire'. See above
<b>River Avon</b>		
	Potential serious damage to the unique Avon riverine	An ecology report has been produced as part of the evidence base. This issue will however need to be considered in more detail if the site progresses
	Danger of drowning, especially for small children from river and reed beds	Agreed. At the time of a planning application this element will need to be addressed to ensure an adequate barrier is erected
	Potential dumping of debris/contamination of the river	This can happen at any time and should not necessarily be levelled against the Gypsy and Traveller community. If they are living permanently on a site which is their home, they are very unlikely to treat their environment in this way, particularly if they own the land. It is acknowledged that this could be a problem no matter who is living in the vicinity or visiting the area
	On river floodplain	The flood plain for the river is on the opposite bank and not on the bank west of the river which is at a higher level and does not suffer flooding from the river. There is however potential for the land to flood from the brook that crosses the land to the south. A high level report prepared for the land owners in advance of the consultation suggests that flooding from the brook has not been a problem. Consultation responses from residents seem to disagree with that and more work would be required if the site were to progress. See the comments by the Environment Agency below
<b>Flood Risk</b>		
	Neither the sequential test nor the exception test has been undertaken	A high level report prepared for the land owners in advance of the consultation suggests that flooding from the brook has not been a problem. Consultation responses from residents seem to disagree with that and more

		work would be required if the site were to progress. See the comments by the Environment Agency below
	Site is at risk of flood and should be excluded	See above
	Area is in Flood Zone 3 where vulnerable caravans should not be located	Agreed that Flood Zone 3 should be avoided but measures could be taken to ensure that land would not be in Flood Zone 3. See above
	Accompanying report is high level and sets out options but doesn't say risk can be eliminated or outline costs	See above
	Report states lack of flooding but modelling is out of date and hasn't taken into account building of elevated section of M40 for example. Further modelling is required and effectiveness of alleviation scheme cannot be gauged until this is done.	See above
	Flood plain, but study needs more work	See above
	Part of the site is on a designated flood plain within flood zones 2 and 3, and there are no specific plans (or costings) to mitigate	See above
	WDC has undertaken insufficient research to prove that mitigation work can be undertaken to completely eliminate any flood risk	See above
	Location in a flood zone is dangerous for children and animals	Agreed. See above
	Additional hardstanding required will increase flood risk	Agreed. See above
	Report that the brook does not flood is incorrect as it did in 2007	See above
<b>Health &amp; Safety</b>		
	Concern for safety of school children when site is built	Unsure why this should be
	Would not be happy with child walking to school alone if plan goes ahead	This is a personal perception and not a planning issue
	Proximity to M40 creates health hazard	Advice would need to be taken on some safety aspects if the site were to go ahead. Odour, noise and other reports have been obtained at a high level, but more detail would be required
	Not a safe place for children, especially when	Advice would need to be taken on some safety

	they will spend most of their time outside playing	aspects if the site were to go ahead. Odour, noise and other reports have been obtained at a high level, but more detail would be required
	Not a safe environment close to sewage works and motorway	Advice would need to be taken on some safety aspects if the site were to go ahead. Odour, noise and other reports have been obtained at a high level, but more detail would be required
	The provision of utilities on the sites is questionable with running water, toilet facilities, and sewage being bare necessities	Agreed. Advice would need to be taken with regard to the provision of utilities, however there are residential properties close by with such utilities so it should not be difficult to provide these
	Fertilizer from the surrounding farm land will have an impact	Advice would need to be taken on some safety aspects if the site were to go ahead
	Potential disease from un-vaccinated dogs	This is a personal perception and not a planning issue
	More pedestrians crossing the road as the travellers will want to also move on foot. The speed and constant traffic will put lives at risk	Fifteen pitches are not considered to represent a large increase in potential traffic movements. See Highways Agency comment below
<b>Noise</b>		
	Noise assessment not of acceptable quality occurring in single 4 hour period in good conditions	Further work will need to be carried out if the site is taken forward
	This location clearly breaches Government guidelines	Readings taken in advance of the public consultation do not indicate this to be the case. However, it is acknowledged that more work would need to be carried out if the site is taken forward
	Noise issue is important due to the high density of children likely to be on site, living in homes more susceptible to noise pollution	See above
	Noise assessment undertaken cannot have captured the environmental noise at the proposed site at its worst especially as recordings were limited in time. WDC cannot have the information it needs to take into consideration the full extent of the noise problem. The author of the report uses PPG 24 (Planning Policy	See above

	Guidance24: Planning and Noise) to measure each site against. This guidance is out of date. The study needs repeating to avoid time-pressured compromises and utilise current guidance. Before considering the proposed site, WDC should provide evidence that there are not alternative quieter sites. If it can provide such evidence, then noise mitigation works would be necessary impacting the commercial viability of the site (estimated costs of mitigation unclear)	
	West Midlands ambulance service hub is based in this area	This is taken into account in the noise surveys
<b>Impact on Schools, GP surgery and other facilities</b>		
	These are already under pressure	Advice has been taken from Warwickshire County Council as the education authority. There are plans for new schools coming forward as part of the Local Plan and the new residential developments allocated therein, providing additional spaces. In the meantime, the number of school age children likely to be generated by 15 pitches is not deemed to be excessive
	Proximity to Aylesford School	This is positive in terms of the criteria which require that sites are located close to schools, GP surgeries and other services and facilities
	Situation will worsen with more new houses and now a Gypsy & Traveller site	Advice has been taken from Warwickshire County Council as the education authority. There are plans for new schools coming forward as part of Local Plan and the new residential developments allocated therein, providing additional spaces. In the meantime, the number of school age children likely to be generated by 15 pitches is not deemed to be excessive
	Children will have to travel further to school	Children will only have to travel further to school if the catchment areas are altered. Warwickshire County Council will advise on this

	Schools aren't that close for young children walking from this site	The nearest primary school is Newburgh School and this is just over a mile away (measured along footpaths, not as the crow flies)
	Disruptive children will hold others back	This is the case with disruptive children from any background and should not be levelled solely at the Gypsy and Traveller community
	They (Gypsies and Travellers) will have priority at GP surgery, schools etc.	This is not the case. Gypsies and Travellers would be residents of this area and if registered with the GP surgery or for school places, would be treated exactly the same way as other residents
	Site would mean permanent Gypsy site right next to the school	This is positive in terms of the criteria which require that sites are located close to schools, GP surgeries and other services and facilities
	GP surgery has objected that there are inadequate facilities	The GP services and any inadequacies have to be taken up with the health authority. Additional facilities have to be applied for by those services
	No funding for promised new school	The funding for the school will need to come from legal agreements which are part of the relevant planning permissions and will be paid by the developers of the new sites. Additionally, the Council has published a draft CIL scheme that will ensure that funds for infrastructure, such as schools, will be paid for out of a 'pot' of money which developers contribute to as part of the legal agreement to develop new sites. Funding will be obtained from either source or from a combination of both
	Difficult to access a local dentist under the NHS	This is a general problem and not specific to this area
	Gypsy children would not fit in at school	This is a personal perception and not a planning issue
<b>Impact on Tourism</b>		
	Negative impact on tourist industry locally	There is no reason or evidence to show that this would be an issue. In terms of appearance, the site is well screened from

		Stratford Road and at its nearest point in excess of 300m away. The topography of the land and the fact that dwellings are only single storey and would be behind the employment development means that it is unlikely that it will be seen at all from the road. There is a wide range of uses along Stratford Road, some more attractive than others. Tourism hasn't suffered as a result of this mix of street views
	Negative impact for tourist coming into the town along this major approach	See above
	Impact on town's image	See above
	In close proximity to two hotels and to restaurants	These are not immediately adjacent and are unlikely to see any impact other than perhaps the patronage of permanent residents on the site using and supporting local facilities
<b>Impact on Commercial Sites</b>		
	Negative effect on Tournament Fields which remains partially undeveloped	There has been a suppressed demand for employment land for new businesses during several years of recession and this has led to some land not yet being developed at Tournament Fields, however, there has recently been an upturn in the demand for such land and as a result planning applications have been received for the business park. There is no reason to believe that this trend will not continue if growth continues, regardless of what happens with regard to the Gypsy and Traveller site
<b>Impact on Economy</b>		
	Businesses will not welcome Traveller custom	This is a personal perception and not a planning matter
	Negative impact on tourism and local businesses with shop/restaurant owners already closing early at Bank Holiday race meetings when there is an influx of Gypsies and Travellers.	Businesses choose whether to open or not and whether to take advantage of increased trade on those days or close. A small permanent site on the edge of the town is unlikely to have an impact other than to slightly increase the patronage of such businesses if residents on the site choose to avail themselves of local

		facilities
	Take up of new businesses and new houses is likely to be affected by the Gypsy & Traveller site	There is no reason or evidence to support this view
	We may be moving out of recession, but the addition of a G&T site in such close proximity to "Warwick's Premier Employment Site", can only have a negative effect on attracting local business.	There has been a suppressed demand for employment land for new businesses during several years of recession and this has led to some land not yet being developed at Tournament Fields, however, there has recently been an upturn in the demand for such land and as a result planning applications have been received for the business park. There is no reason to believe that this trend will not continue if growth continues, regardless of what happens with regard to the Gypsy and Traveller site
	Close proximity to prestigious training centre	There is no reason or evidence to suggest that this would lead to any specific problems
	Area should be developed for employment. Any deviation from this will delay the delivery of the employment use and discourage businesses	The Local Plan will be allocating enough land at this location to ensure it meets employment land needs over the Plan period
	Development of this site for commercial use is the most financially rewarding within the 'cordon sanitaire'	This site is not within the 'Cordon Sanitaire'. The land which will be allocated for employment uses is partly within the 'Cordon Sanitaire'
	Land was earmarked for employment which would boost the local economy	The Local Plan will be allocating enough land at this location to ensure it meets employment land needs over the Plan period
	Shops and cafe's that rely on tourist revenue will close, with loss of local jobs and revenue	There is no reason or evidence to support this view
	Site is considered irreconcilable in this location with the proposed employment allocation	There is no reason or evidence to support this view
	Economy is still in a delicate state and this would not help	There is no reason or evidence to support this view
<b>Air, Soil, Water Quality</b>		
	SA raised red flag against air, water and soil quality but doesn't say how you will resolve this	Reports that have been prepared with regard to these elements are at a high level. If the site were to be taken forward, more detailed

		information will be required including mitigation measures
	Soil contamination from previous flooding of the Water Treatment Plant	This has not shown up on any of the research carried out to date, but additional work will need to be carried out if the site is taken forward
	It is agricultural land so requires hard surfacing works and connection to utilities	Agreed
	SA acknowledges the issue of the site being on a Nitrate Vulnerable Zone 3, but has provided no further guidance on what the realistic contamination risk is	Further work would be required if the site was taken forward
	Having acknowledged that there will be a loss of Grade 3a agricultural land, the document provides no further information on how this will be mitigated	Grade 3a land is not 'best and most versatile' agricultural land quality. For that reason, it is acceptable to utilise this land ahead of any land with a better agricultural land classification
	Loss of Grade 2 farmland (currently under grazing)	The land is Grade 3a (see above)
	Agricultural land Classification Grade 3a/4 not 2 which would make the situation even worse	The land is Grade 3a (see above)
<b>Green Field</b>		
	It is a green field site. Planners should attach weight to "effective use of previously developed brownfield), untidy or derelict land"	There has been considerable work carried out on identifying suitable sites for Gypsies and Travellers. These have included 41 sites that have been consulted upon and many others which have not been suitable to consider further due to severe constraints. Having exhausted all such potential sites and all those not made available to us by landowners, we have been forced to look at green field sites
	The site is in the green belt where development should not be allowed	The site is a green field site but is not in the Green Belt
	Designated as a Rural Area and should be protected from development	The land has no official designation as a rural area
	In an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty and in the Green Belt	The land is not designated as either an Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty nor is it in the Green Belt, although it is a green field site
<b>Screening</b>		

	Site requires a significant amount of screening/protection from the main tourist route into Warwick, the M40, the River Avon and the Severn Trent sewage works	Agreed and the site area allows ample opportunity to provide this
	For safety, barriers/fences/landscaping would presumably be required on all four sides giving a feeling of an isolated 'secure compound'	Screening of the site and safety precautions would need to be incorporated, but this would not necessarily involve a lot of hard landscaping/barriers etc. It is not intended to turn the site into a 'compound' and these matters would be dealt with through a planning application if the site continues to the next stage
	There is no information as to how the site will be screened	These are detailed matters for a planning application if the site continues to the next stage
	Loss of privacy for existing residents and spoilt view	The layout and design of the site would need to address matters of privacy through a planning application. No-one has a right to a view in planning terms
<b>Habitat and Biodiversity</b>		
	Often bats are flying in this area, a full bat survey is required	Agreed. This would be carried out if the site were to continue to the next stage
	Danger to wildlife	This would need to be addressed at the time of a planning application if the site were to continue to the next stage
	Impact on ecology	A high level ecology report was commissioned as part of the work carried out at the time of the consultation. A more detailed report would be required if the site were to continue to the next stage
	Not yet known if there is a 'holt' (Otter habitat) near to the site or if there are any other endangered species on or near the site	A high level ecology report was commissioned as part of the work carried out at the time of the consultation. A more detailed report would be required if the site were to continue to the next stage
	Should be allocating land of least environmental value	This is one of the criteria which determines the most suitable sites, however it is acknowledged that not all the criteria will be met on any one site, so there is a balance to

		be reached as to which sites are the most appropriate and mitigation put in place to reduce the impacts
<b>Listed Building/historic context</b>		
	Longbridge Manor, now HQ of Forever Living Products, is beautifully maintained and has lovely gardens. Longbridge Lane is one of the few remaining remnants of historic landscape on the main route into Warwick	The Manor is in excess of 400m away from the nearest point of the potential site. Fields, other dwellings, a brook, private and public roads are between the two. It is not considered likely that the site would impact on either the building, its setting, views or the business use of the buildings. This view is supported by the specialist Historic Assessment report produced as an evidence base document for this consultation and is available to view on the Council's website
	The setting of the Castle Park would be affected	It is not considered likely that the site would impact Castle Park, its setting or views. This view is supported by the specialist Historic Assessment report produced as an evidence base document for this consultation and is available to view on the Council's website
	Need report into the impact on heritage assets and on their setting	A Heritage Assessment report was produced as an evidence base document for this consultation and is available to view on the Council's website
	The site adjoins the Grade I Registered Park and Garden of Warwick Castle Park, and Warwick Conservation Area	Noted. See above
<b>Effect on house values/sales</b>		
	Detrimental effect on house prices	This is not a planning issue and cannot be taken into account in deciding the suitability of the site. However, work carried out by the CMRA and reported verbally at a public meeting at Aylesford School, for the previous list of Preferred Options sites on 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2013, said that estate agents report that

		initially house prices do dip, but that they quickly recover and to their former values in line with those which would have been experienced had the site not existed
	Severe implications for those who have recently purchased homes overlooking the site/didn't show up on searches	Searches do not normally include land this far away from a dwelling unless specifically asked for by the conveyancer. As sites have not yet been allocated however, there is no commitment and these may not therefore show up on searches until they are
	Impact on those trying to sell houses, now and in the future	This is not a planning issue and cannot be taken into account in deciding the suitability of the site. However, work carried out by the CMRA and reported verbally at a public meeting at Aylesford School, on the previous list of Preferred Options sites on 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2013, said that estate agents report that initially house prices and demand in the area do dip, but that they quickly recover and to their former values in line with those which would have been experienced had the site not existed
	What financial compensation will be available when house prices fall?	There will not be any financial compensation should the site be allocated. However, work carried out by the CMRA and reported verbally at a public meeting at Aylesford School, on the previous list of Preferred Options sites on 15 <sup>th</sup> July 2013, said that estate agents report that initially house prices do dip, but that they quickly recover and to values at levels which would have been experienced had the site not existed
	Increase in cost of insurance policies	There is no evidence to support the view that insurance policies are affected
	Proximity to housing	Sites close to housing are encouraged by the criteria used to select sites since this places them close to the accompanying facilities such as schools, health care, shops and community facilities

<b>Fear of Crime</b>		
	Concern about increase in crime or anti-social behaviour	The police report that they are not aware of specific problems relating to these issues disproportionate to those which are experienced due to the settled community
	Low employment opportunities might create anti-social behaviour, criminal activities	The district does not suffer from high unemployment compared to other parts of country. Warwick compares very favourably. Many Gypsies and Travellers already have their own businesses set up so dealing with low employment opportunities is not seen to be a major issue
	Development will increase problems experienced with illegal encampment	The introduction of permanent sites and a transit site is to help deal with the situation of illegal encampments. WCC will also be delivering 'emergency stopping places' elsewhere in the County which will provide places for those passing through the area. If illegal encampments do take place, they will be offered one of these pitches. If they do not wish to stay there, the police and WCC have increased powers to eject them from the County and in a very short time period
	Crime regularly reported to increase during times of illegal encampments	The police report that they are not aware of specific problems relating to these issues disproportionate to those which are experienced due to the settled community
	Street lights are switched off at midnight. Residents concerned about anti-social behaviour	This is the current situation and the inclusion of this site is not considered to have any additional impact
	Need assurances that the site will be policed and enforced by the Council or the Police	The police report that they are not aware of specific problems relating to these issues disproportionate to those which are experienced due to the settled community. The Council will not be managing the sites, but will enforce against any licence breaches or planning restrictions
<b>Experiences</b>		

	Negative experience of previous illegal encampment(s) here	The introduction of permanent sites and a transit site is to help deal with the situation of illegal encampments. WCC will also be delivering 'emergency stopping places' elsewhere in the County which will provide places for those passing through the area. If illegal encampments do take place, they will be offered one of these pitches. If they do not wish to stay there, the police and WCC have increased powers to eject them from the County and in a very short time period
	Negative experience of sites elsewhere	See above
	Site will expand onto adjoining land with no way of preventing this	The Council will not be managing the sites, but will enforce against any licence breaches or planning restrictions. In extreme cases this could result in a revocation of the licence which would mean the Gypsies and Travellers being evicted from the site in the worst case scenario
	Can never be harmony/ integration between the two communities	This is a particularly difficult criterion to meet. Experience reported from elsewhere has been encouraging after an initial settling in period and once trust is built up, but there will always be cases where this does not happen
<b>Scale</b>		
	Size of site inappropriate for small village of Longbridge	It is generally accepted that since the taking up of land around the area for the motorway and again for junction improvements, the village of Longbridge as such no longer exists within the accepted definition of a village or character. The area has expanded to include new development and remaining property once a part of Longbridge is now viewed as a more sporadic development of a few properties which were once part of the village. These properties access their facilities and services either at Chase Meadow or in the town of Warwick.
	Size of the site is right at the top end of the current planning guidelines	Agreed, the Government guidelines indicate that a site of 15 pitches should be considered

		the maximum to reduce the issues associated with the management and maintenance of large sites
	There are Government guidelines which provide guidance on size. Therefore, this is a matter of fact	The Government guidelines indicate that a site of 5 - 15 pitches should be considered the maximum to reduce the issues associated with the management and maintenance of large sites
	Some gypsy families live on Chase Meadow, and this has not caused noticeable problems, as they live in houses, and in small numbers so integrate. This would not happen with the WDC proposal for a gypsy ghetto for the maximum number of gypsy families as allowed under government rules	The positive experience of Gypsies and Travellers living in houses should indicate that there are a large number of Travellers who wish to and are able to integrate into the local community, often without anyone knowing their background, traditions and lifestyle. The same should be said of sites which accommodate Gypsies and Travellers who choose to live in caravans and mobile homes and follow their lifestyle in a more traditional way
<b>Evidence Base</b>		
	No evidence provided that the proposed site would be available, deliverable or viable	At the time of the consultation, it was believed that this could be the case. The response of the landowners to the formal consultation process however will indicate the current status
	If it is a possibility that the track serving Longbridge Manor, a Grade 2 Listed Building would be used, then WDC should have flagged this up for the benefit of local residents	The decision on an access to the site was not made at this point in time. The landowners involved were in discussions about all matters relating to the location of the employment site and a potential Gypsy and Traveller site and if/how they could be delivered. Furthermore, consultation was taking place with the highway authority regarding potential access points. This consultation is one stage in the consideration of potential sites and does not necessarily lead to an allocation. If the site were to proceed to the next stage, more information would be required/reported
	In a number of fundamental areas the	See above

	consultation document has no information whatsoever that local residents could use in determining the suitability of the proposed site (for example the impact on local economy), and in other areas WDC has alluded to further updates and reports that have not subsequently been published during the term of the 6-week consultation (for example expected guidance in relation to suitability of site access)	
	Lack of a transparent feasibility assessment may show that the land is not viable anyway due to the cost of access, landscaping, flood defences, fencing and providing local services	There is no point in carrying out detailed feasibility assessments at this stage. The consultation asks for the views of local people and the statutory consultees to ascertain whether the site will receive further consideration. If the site progresses to the next stage of the process, such assessments would be necessary, although the cost of the infrastructure would not fall entirely on the purchaser of the Gypsy and Traveller site since the employment land would also necessitate considerable contributions toward the costs
	This site was not identified within the South Housing Market Area Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment or in the Council's own commissioned Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment for Warwick District 2012	These documents do not suggest or allocate sites to accommodate Gypsies and Travellers. They assess the need that there is in the district to inform how many pitches are required. The South Housing Market Area Assessment is out of date and was replaced by the Warwick District Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment published in November 2012
	Lack of robustness and adequacy of GTAA	The GTAA was prepared on behalf of the Council by the research team at Salford University specialising in this work. The Council has reviewed the work carried out and are satisfied as to the content and the provenance of the document
	The Council's evidence base considers that the "small scale of the proposal" will mean it is unlikely to have a negative effect. Council must	This is the assessment made in the Sustainability Appraisal which looks at all aspects likely to be impacted by the proposal

	identify and assess the significance of any asset that may be affected by a proposal	on sustainability. Other reports have assessed the potential for flooding, noise, odours and the impact on heritage assets. These reports are published on the Council's website
	There is not a proven need for this site or any other	A GTAA was prepared on behalf of the Council by the research team at Salford University specialising in this work. The report states that the district has a need for 31 pitches over a 15 year period, 25 within the first five years and a rolling five year land supply to meet the remainder. The Council has reviewed the work carried out and are satisfied as to the content and the provenance of the document
	Full environmental assessment needed including the psychological effects of the sewage smell	More information would be required in addition to that already published as part of the consultation, if the site goes forward to the next stage
<b>Consultation</b>		
	At 6 weeks, the consultation period was too short	This is the standard length of time for such a consultation and is laid down in the government regulations governing this part of the process
	This site was not mentioned in previous/original consultations. Why was this not suggested previously?	After the consultation for the " preferred options " for Sites for Gypsies and Travellers which ran between March and May 2014, Severn Trent Water submitted to the Council, a response to the Publication Draft Local Plan wherein it was suggested that with some investment in the sewage works the Cordon Sanitaire, which currently encircles the sewage works, could be reduced thus releasing land for development. The analysis of the responses to the G&T Preferred Option Consultation had just been completed and we were therefore aware of the shortage of site options and the need to think

		<p>differently to resolve the issue. There had been some informal communication/discussions prior to this about using the land for employment. This didn't pre-date the approval of the Preferred Option for G&amp;T sites in March. The site had not been subject to consultation, however, the Executive of the Council agreed on 30 July 2014 to undertake a consultation on the release of the site for development. This consultation is the next stage in the process of identifying suitable sites for allocation through the Local Plan process. The consultation is a 'Preferred Options' consultation and does not therefore commit the Council to allocate the site in the Development Plan Document. Views and comments from this consultation will contribute toward the decision as to the future direction for this potential site.</p> <p>The Council considers any sites which are brought to its attention for potential development and consults on any that are potentially suitable. A total of 41 sites were consulted upon previously, even though only 20 of those were on the original list. More have been suggested as part of this consultation and they are detailed below</p>
	Cannot see this as a site in list GT1 - GT20. Website should be updated to show sites that are being considered	See above. This site was not one of the original sites considered
	Why were residents not informed?	The consultation on the site was advertised in the usual manner: through the local papers, including the editorial, via the email alert service to all those registered as having an interest in this topic, by letter to statutory consultees and on the Council's website. In addition to this, Chase Meadow Residents Association leafleted households on the estate
	Site included at the last minute	After the consultation for the " preferred options " for Sites for Gypsies and Travellers which ran between March and May 2014, Severn Trent Water submitted to the Council, a

		<p>response to the Publication Draft Local Plan wherein it was suggested that with some investment in the sewage works the Cordon Sanitaire, which currently encircles the sewage works, could be reduced thus releasing land for development. This could be achieved by STW investing in some improvements which could be carried out at the sewage works.</p> <p>The analysis of the responses to the G&amp;T Preferred Option Consultation had just been completed and we were therefore aware of the shortage of site options and the need to think differently to resolve the issue. There had been some informal communication/discussions prior to this about using the land for employment. This didn't pre-date the approval of the Preferred Option for G&amp;T sites in March. The site had not been subject to consultation, however, the Executive of the Council agreed on 30 July 2014 to undertake a consultation on the release of the site for development. This consultation is the next stage in the process of identifying suitable sites for allocation through the Local Plan process. The consultation is a 'Preferred Options' consultation and does not therefore commit the Council to allocate the site in the Development Plan Document. Views and comments from this consultation will contribute toward the decision as to the future direction for this potential site</p>
	Residents views are ignored	<p>There have been many consultations undertaken as part of the Local Plan process and reference to those will show that far from ignoring resident's views, they are very much taken into account when considering the next stage. The outcome may not be/cannot be what everyone wants, but views are certainly read, summarised and then assessed before a decision is taken. This process has resulted in a number of changes throughout the progress of the Plan, of which this is part</p>

	Hope the views of Warwick residents continue to be considered seriously	See above
	No information on Council's website	The consultation on the site was advertised in the usual manner: through the local papers, including the editorial, via the email alert service to all those registered as having an interest in this topic, by letter to statutory consultees and on the Council's website. In addition, background reports were also added to the website
	Assume site has been included with no communication with residents/businesses	See above
	How can site be considered without consultation as with other previously considered sites?	This is the public consultation stage, as with previously considered sites
	Council has failed to offer discussions/meetings at a time that everyone can make	Two 'drop in' sessions were set up at the Chase Meadow Community Centre to ensure that those living close to the site would be able to meet Council officers and ask questions/gain information. We had planned that these would span the late afternoon and early evening, however, as the Centre is fully booked in the evening with regular long term commitments, we booked the latest sessions we could. This meant that we had to finish at 18:30 allowing the next user access. It was considered more important to hold these sessions within the area rather than late into the evening elsewhere. Officers were also available by telephone/in person during normal office hours at the Council Offices for those unable to attend
	The Council should not ignore the will of such a high number of residents	It is the quality of the planning content of the response rather than the numbers of residents who respond that is of the greatest importance
	The Council has failed to show why this is a better site than those previously considered	The Council has not decided that it is a better site than those previously considered at this stage. The public consultation is part of the process which helps to frame the decision together with background evidence on

		technical matters. More information would be required before the technical attributes could be assessed fully. The result of the public consultation also forms part of the background to further decisions on whether to take the site forward
	Consultation has been misleading	More details are needed to respond to this
	No time for residents to share thoughts	The six week consultation period is the standard length of time and is laid down in the government regulations governing this part of the process
	Two meetings were held during the day so workers couldn't attend, queues were long, time with planners, minimal	Two 'drop in' sessions were set up at the Chase Meadow Community Centre to ensure that those living close to the site would be able to meet Council officers and ask questions/gain information. We had planned that these would span the late afternoon and early evening, however, as the Centre is fully booked in the evening with long term commitments, we booked the latest sessions we could. This meant that we had to finish at 18:30 allowing the next user access. It was considered more important to hold these sessions within the area rather than late into the evening elsewhere. Officers were also available by telephone/in person during normal office hours at the Council Offices for those unable to attend. In order to see as many people as possible, officers would need to restrict the amount of time spent with individuals, however, sessions usually result in many people listening in to the questions and answers which assists understanding and answers their own questions often
	Consultation should be redone when all information available	There is another stage of consultation if this site is carried forward. More detailed information would need to be prepared before this next stage as reports have been at a high level at this stage
	No attendees at public meeting called by	The Council's Chief Executive sent a letter to

	residents association	the Residents Association in response to the invitation. He explained that such meetings rarely offer most attendees the opportunity for their specific matters to be addressed and so do not aid the overall consultation process. Additionally, those attending such meetings tend to voice their specific opinions but these cannot be taken into account as consultation responses as they are not in writing, so still require those individuals to formally respond to the consultation
	Criteria for selection differ from those used in previous consultations for other sites	It is recognised that there are criteria that cannot be met on sites. The criteria listed were specific to this site, but respondents were not restricted to these criteria and a wide range of comments were received. Sites that meet the criteria as closely as possible are likely to be more favourably viewed
	Feel that decision has already been made regardless of objections	This is not the case. This is one stage of the process and another consultation stage will have to be gone through before the document is submitted to the Secretary of State
	Inadequate analysis	More detailed information would need to be prepared before the next stage as reports have been at a high level at this stage. The site analysis would be made in detail if the site were to be taken forward
	WDC is highly vulnerable to a successful legal challenge and must abandon the Stratford Road site, and concentrate its efforts on taking forward alternative sites that are more appropriate.	It is uncertain as to why this comment has been made, however the Council will be considering any suggested sites
	Conflicting messages from the planning team at various stages of the process	Unable to comment without a specific example
	The proposed site was not on the short list in early 2014 but became one of the three 'preferred options' in this final round of consultation. This does not reflect a transparent, logical and democratic process.	After the consultation for the " preferred options " for Sites for Gypsies and Travellers which ran between March and May 2014, Severn Trent Water submitted to the Council, a response to the Publication Draft Local Plan wherein it was suggested that with some

		<p>investment in the sewage works the Cordon Sanitaire, which currently encircles the sewage works, could be reduced thus releasing land for development. This could be achieved by STW investing in some improvements which could be carried out at the sewage works.</p> <p>The analysis of the responses to the G&amp;T Preferred Option Consultation had just been completed and we were therefore aware of the shortage of site options and the need to think differently to resolve the issue. There had been some informal communication/discussions prior to this about using the land for employment. This didn't pre-date the approval of the Preferred Option for G&amp;T sites in March. The site had not been subject to consultation, however, the Executive of the Council agreed on 30 July 2014 to undertake a consultation on the release of the site for development. This consultation is the next stage in the process of identifying suitable sites for allocation through the Local Plan process. The consultation is a 'Preferred Options' consultation and does not therefore commit the Council to allocate the site in the Development Plan Document. Views and comments from this consultation will contribute toward the decision as to the future direction for this potential site</p>
	Information that has been made available by WDC was, until mid-way through the consultation period, only accessible via a prolonged trawl through various links on the website. This did not constitute effective communication or consultation	Information has always been available on the website. These documents were all filed under 'evidence base' and then sub headings. Two individuals contacted us asking where the documents could be found, so we also included them on the Gypsy and Traveller site consultation page for ease of access
	Limited publicity of the consultation period resulted in many local residents being completely unaware of the issue, until local volunteers produced and delivered flyers to local homes to raise awareness	The consultation on the site was advertised in the usual manner: through the local papers, including the editorial, via the email alert service to all those registered as having an interest in this topic, by letter to statutory consultees and on the Council's website. Word

		of mouth is a very important way of information being passed on and the residents association not only made this a major news item on their website but also leafleted homes to make residents aware
	The credibility of the public consultation has been seriously undermined and has not been of sufficient quality or rigour to meet the statutory requirements for such an exercise and has been done in too short a time period	This consultation is one stage in the process of identifying suitable sites for allocation through the Local Plan process. The consultation is a 'Preferred Options' consultation and does not therefore commit the Council to allocate the site in the Development Plan Document. Views and comments from this consultation will contribute toward the decision as to the future direction for this potential site. If the site does progress to the next stage, more detailed reports will be required
	Any decision will be void due to lack of information or misinformation	See above
	WDC has failed to fulfil their statutory duty to consult neighbouring Local Authorities	This is not the case. The Council holds on its database a standard set of statutory consultees. This includes all neighbouring Local Authorities. Consultations are always sent to these statutory consultees although responses are not always received
	The process for selecting sites has been flawed and demonstrated great inconsistency in the application of NPFF and DCLG requirements and guidelines; this is continuing in terms of the criteria applied to the proposed Stratford Road site	Specific examples are needed if this comment is to receive a response
	No official communication has been received from WDC. Surely there has to be consultation	The consultation on the site was advertised in the usual manner: through the local papers, including the editorial, via the email alert service to all those registered as having an interest in this topic, by letter to statutory consultees and on the Council's website. Word of mouth is a very important way of information being passed on and the residents association not only made this a major news item on their website but also leafleted homes

		to make residents aware
	Has the Council consulted the local fire authority for its opinion regarding access to the development and, if so, where is the fire authority's report?	The emergency services are statutory consultees and are automatically consulted on every stage of the plan making process. The fire authority has not responded to this particular consultation
	The community's view and opinions should have priority over the local Council hitting a target set to accommodate travelling families that is unrealistic and excessive in that available sites are not already full	There are no available sites in the district therefore there are no sites not already full. The target set is for 31 pitches over a period of 15 years; 25 within the first 5 years. This is to meet the current, historic and future need
	Today (08/12/14) the online questionnaire relating to the Stratford Road site has been removed from the council's website, when the deadline is 12/12/14.	There has been no issue that we have been made aware of over the online questionnaire. The service continued up to the deadline of 16:45 on 12 <sup>th</sup> December. Our software supplier has confirmed this to be the case
<b>Duty to Co-operate</b>		
	Limited if any co-operation with other local authorities with regard to identification of sites for Gypsies and Travellers and lack of robustness and adequacy of GTAA	Warwick District Council has worked in co-operation with all adjoining councils, but each has their own needs to meet and none could assist with sharing sites for example. The GTAA was prepared on behalf of the Council by the research team at Salford University specialising in this work. The Council has reviewed the work carried out and are satisfied as to the content and the provenance of the document
<b>Other</b>		
	Increase in low flying aircraft since Birmingham runway extended	This does not appear to be an issue and has not been reported as such in the noise assessments carried out at the site and published on the Council's website, however, more detailed surveys would need to be carried out if this site were to progress to the next stage
	Why should people living there for free share same facilities?	Residents would not be 'living there for free'. They would either have purchased the land themselves and set up their own site at their own cost, or would be renting pitches from a

		social landlord (Housing Association). They would also be paying Council Tax and for all services. They would be entitled to use the same facilities as any of the settled community
	Make it a green area such as a park or woodland	The area is largely in agricultural use and if not developed will remain in agricultural use for the foreseeable future
	Proximity of the other gypsy sites in the area	There are currently no other Gypsy and Traveller sites in the area although there is a potential future site at Europa Way (1.8 miles as the crow flies) and one at Leamington Football Club at Harbury Lane (4.4 miles as the crow flies). The sites available to choose from are limited by the extent of the green belt. This means that the search has been concentrated to the south of Leamington, Warwick and Whitnash
	It would affect the attractiveness of rowing on the Avon (rowing clubs use this section of the river)	There is no reason or evidence to support this view
	Understand Council has met its obligation so why is this site needed?	The Council has most certainly not met its obligation. There are no Gypsy and Traveller sites currently within the district and there is a need for 31 pitches over a 15 year period, 25 within the first five years and a rolling five year land supply to meet the remainder.
	Building sites here will lead to resentment from travellers that such a poor place was deemed suitable for them	We are working closely with a number of families who are looking for sites in this district. There is interest in this site and others that we have considered
	Gypsies lifestyle is more associated with living in the countryside	Gypsies and Travellers have been forced to live in the countryside in the past having not been welcomed into more urban areas and with insufficient official sites to accommodate them, however, to meet their needs in a sustainable fashion they should to be located closer to the facilities and services afforded by towns and larger villages. The most suitable sites are therefore on the edge of towns and villages
	Travellers like isolation so why not give them	See above

	that	
	The ever contentious issue of accommodating 'travellers' is a current (but I believe under review) requirement from the Government	The Government review has not yet been published and therefore we are still working under current requirements. If the findings of the Government review come into force, the definition of a 'Traveller' will change. In that case, we will need to review our own requirements and reassess the need locally
	Not all Gypsies and Travellers are a nuisance but they seem to be in the minority	The media is keen to publish negative stories about all members of our communities, however, there is good and bad in both. Statistics do not support the view that there are more Travellers in prison as a percentage of the population than those in the settled community for example
	Some dwellers use horses to tow caravans, these will need grazing land. How much land will they require for this purpose?	This will be a matter for Gypsy and Traveller families to discuss with the planning authority when applying for planning permission. There are few that rely on horses to draw their caravans today, although some still also keep ponies for pleasure. Enough land needs to be put aside to accommodate those who do. This will very much depend on the individual needs of each family on the site and the number of horses/ponies they own
	Where will the money come from to fund all of this? Will this money come out of our council taxes, or will the cost be met by the Government?	The site proposed for the use of Gypsies and Travellers will either be purchased, set up and managed by the Gypsies and Travellers themselves or by a social landlord. It is not and never has been the intention of Warwick District Council to own or manage any of these sites. In some cases, there are Government grants available to assist with the purchase and setting up of sites
<b>Comments from Environment Agency</b>		
	The detailed modelling EA has of this area is the River Avon 2009 Model, which demonstrates that there is no risk of flooding	

	<p>to the site from the River Avon. The model shows the site which is on the right bank of the watercourse is 3m higher than the left bank. There should be an investigation to assess the level of flood risk that the brook poses.</p> <p>EA is not aware of contamination issues relating to this site however this does not preclude the possibility of contamination existing due to current or former site uses. Should the site currently or formerly have been subject to land-use(s) which have the potential to have caused contamination of the underlying soils and groundwater then any Planning Application must be supported by a Preliminary Risk Assessment to demonstrate that the risks posed to 'Controlled Waters' by any contamination are understood by the applicant and can be safely managed.</p> <p>Site investigation, risk assessment and remediation may subsequently be required. EA actively encourages the use of SuDS at new developments, however proposals for the drainage of surface or roof water into the ground will need to take into account the findings of the Preliminary Risk Assessment and any subsequent site investigation. If contamination is present and surface water is to be drained to ground then the contamination risk assessment will need to consider the additional infiltration from the surface and roof water system(s).</p> <p>The discharge of treated sewage effluent into surface water or to ground may require an Environmental Permit from the EA. At the time of applying the applicant will have to justify why connection to the public foul sewer is not possible.</p> <p>The EA guidance comments that "It is recommended that chemical toilet waste is not discharged to a package treatment plant, as</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>the chemicals may poison the treatment system and cause pollution." Consequently should it be proposed to discharge foul effluent generated by this development to ground, a separate contained system will be required to take chemical toilet waste</p>	
<b>Comments from Natural England</b>	<p>The proposed allocation of land at Stratford Road, does not appear likely to impact on any designated site or landscape in such a way that might give rise to an objection. We note the proximity of this allocation to the River Avon which, according to our records, is designated as a Local Site (contrary to the impression given by the Sustainability Appraisal Addendum). We commend the inclusion of provisions that 'development will need to ensure that there are no negative effects on the River Avon' and encourage the Local Planning Authority to consider possible opportunities to enhance the designated feature</p>	
<b>Comments from the Highways Agency</b>	<p>Given the relatively small scale of the site and its likely provision of up to 15 permanent pitches, with access off the A429, it is expected that the level of trip generation would be low and that there would be no material impact on the nearest sections of the Strategic Road Network - which, in this instance comprises the A46 and M40. The proposed allocation is unlikely to have any bearing on the overall transport evidence underpinning the Local Plan or the related IDP - on which the Agency's comments of 16 July 2014 were based. Highways Agency has no further comment in respect of this document</p>	
<b>Comments from Warwickshire County</b>	<p>We support the District Council's proposal to allocate sustainable and affordable sites to</p>	

<b>Council</b>	<p>meet the permanent residential needs of this District's Gypsy and Traveller Community and Travelling Show People through the Local Plan process. The current consultation sets out an alternative site option that is potentially suitable to take forward as an allocation in a Development Plan Document.</p> <p>The County Council supports the District Councils' commissioned evidence through the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) for Warwick District, undertaken by Salford University. The report was published in November 2012 and demonstrates a need for 31 permanent pitches to be provided over a 15 year period, 25 within the first five years and in addition, 6-8 transit pitches over the full 15 years.</p> <p>The District Council has identified land off Stratford Road at Warwick, which currently lies within a 'cordon sanitaire' around the Sewage Treatment Works. Our records indicate that the site is outside the cordon sanitaire and therefore could be suitable. We suggest that further discussions should take place with the Environment Agency and Severn Trent to identify the extent and limitations of the cordon sanitaire.</p>	
<b>Comments from Rugby Borough Council</b>	Rugby Borough Council officers have no comment to make on the above consultation other than to say will continue to work with officers at Warwick District Council in fulfilling the Duty to Cooperate on the production of sub regional evidence including the joint Green Belt Review and any other relevant strategic issues through the plan making process	
<b>Comments from The Coal Authority</b>	No comments to make at this stage	
<b>Comments from English Heritage</b>	The secondary/indirect impact of the proposal should be considered. For example could the	

	'rural' character of the lane serving the site, and the Grade II* Longbridge Manor, be retained as a consequence? Are intrusive highway works to facilitate the development required? How might these issues be addressed?	
<b>Alternative sites/locations suggested:</b>		
	Harbury Lane	This site would be required in addition to the site at Harbury Lane
	Europa Way	This site would be required in addition to the site at Europa Way
	Nowhere near Chase Meadow	Sites close to housing are encouraged by the criteria used to select sites since this places them close to the accompanying facilities such as schools, health care, shops and community facilities
	Away from large housing estates	Sites close to housing are encouraged by the criteria used to select sites since this places them close to the accompanying facilities such as schools, health care, shops and community facilities
	Why were Barford sites excluded? They seemed to be rejected in haste	The highway authority (WCC) would not allow any additional use of existing accesses or new accesses to be made off the by-pass for reasons of road safety. This meant that the potential sites had no access to them and had to be excluded from further consideration
	Ford Foundry car park	This is not a suitable location for Gypsies and Travellers as it is in the middle of the urban area. Sites should be located on the edge of towns and villages where facilities are available close by
	Travis Perkins site	See above
	Should be hidden away from other communities	Sites close to housing are encouraged by the criteria used to select sites since this places them close to the accompanying facilities such as schools, health care, shops and community

		facilities. This means that sites on the edge of towns and villages are the preferred location
	WCC salt depot on the other side of J15 M40	WCC has not agreed that we can consider this site as they require it for current operational uses. Additionally it is in the green belt which we have omitted from our area of search
	A different location should be sourced out of town & large enough to house all travellers in one place without flood risk, noise pollution & sewage smells. It's not fair on the travellers, you would not expect normal citizens to live in such appalling conditions.	It would be against Government guidelines to put more than 15 pitches on a site. It leads to management and maintenance issues. If we were to locate all our Gypsy and Traveller need on one site, this would mean a very large site of 31 permanent pitches and 6-8 transit pitches. Additionally, it is recognised as good practice not to place permanent and transit sites together.
	It is up to the council to identify suitable land and propose via a proper consultation process	The Council has already done so, but other suggestions have been put to us through the consultation process and we have assessed the suitability of all such sites in our endeavour to allocate the most suitable sites for this use. Each has been put through the consultation process
	The council should be looking for sites closer to major road networks that are more appealing to the traveller community such as the Fosse Way	There is no better access to the major road network than from Longbridge roundabout which gives access to Banbury and beyond, Stratford upon Avon and beyond and many parts of the country via the A46 and M40. There is another potential site at the Leamington Football club which is in very close proximity to the Fosse Way and this site would be easily accessed via this route
	Existing preferred sites on the original plan	These sites have already been assessed and consulted upon. Those that were unsuitable or unavailable were removed from further consideration. Two sites were carried forward from those sites: Land at Europa Way and Leamington Football Club on Harbury Lane. We will need to revisit the original list if this site is not taken forward to the next stage and potentially adopt a new strategy to the

		identification of sites
	Identify sites that are smaller to limit the potential of expansion and sites that are self-sustaining	The Council has looked at all sizes of sites and would prefer smaller sites of 5-10 pitches, however, there are no landowners willing to consider selling land or renting out pitches. Previous representations to consultations have also requested that we look for fewer, bigger sites to reduce the impact on a larger number of people.
	All areas to the north of the district should be considered including green belt if necessary	The Government has tightened its attitude toward use of the green belt to accommodate Gypsy and Traveller sites. Since the majority of the green belt is in the north of the district, this restricts the search to non-green belt land to the south of Warwick, Leamington and Whitnash
	The land at Thickthorn in Kenilworth where the Kenilworth Horse Fair is held. Around The Wardens Cricket Ground	This land is allocated for employment and residential uses. The inclusion of a Gypsy and Traveller site has severe implications for the viability of this site which would result in non-delivery of the development required to support Kenilworth
	Land adjacent to Leamington railway station	This is not a suitable location for Gypsies and Travellers as it is in the middle of the urban area. Sites should be located on the edge of towns and villages where facilities are available close by
	Leamington Rugby ground	This land is not available
	The container storage area at 'Hobson's Choice' on Harbury Lane	This land is not available and is in close proximity to a high pressure gas pipeline precluding further development. It is also highly contaminated from current and past uses and is opposite the chicken farm with accompanying odour problems carried on the prevailing winds. It is also very close to the proposed site at the football ground on Harbury Lane and government guidelines state that sites should not be located in such close proximity
	Siskin Drive, adjacent or close to the site	We have considered this in the past, but land

	operated by Coventry City Council	is either contaminated, too close to Coventry Airport or in the Green Belt, none of which are suitable. It would also be against government guidelines to locate sites this close to one another, particularly given the size of the existing Coventry City Council site
	Many more than 15 pitches could be accommodated on the Football Club site on Harbury Lane if they move out completely	Agreed, but the Government guidelines indicate that a site of 15 pitches should be considered the maximum to reduce the issues associated with the management and maintenance of large sites
	If the Stratford Road site goes forward, the Gypsy & Traveller site should be located further to the north on part of the proposed employment land	This would place a residential site in amongst the employment site. This would not be acceptable to either businesses or Gypsies and Travellers. The land currently under consideration is also outside the 'Cordon Sanitaire' which means that it is less affected by the sewage treatment works odours and operations and could be developed without further remediation at the works
	Recent approval has been made for sites in the Solihull area less than 20 miles away	These sites are to provide for the need within Solihull district. Warwick district has a need of its own to accommodate 31 permanent pitches over a 15 year period, 25 of which are required within the first five years
	Perhaps land could be found adjacent to the Ufton Landfill site instead	This area is not within Warwick district and could therefore not be considered to meet our need
	There is a ready made caravan site just out of Warwick on the Banbury Road which has now been developed, but not used, for the past 3 or 4 years. This would be a much better site for both the travellers and the people of Warwick and also those visiting the town/castle	The Council has discussed this site through the 'Preferred Options' consultation and with the owners of the site specifically about making it a site for Gypsies and Travellers, however, the landowners are developing the site for the holiday caravan park, implementing the planning permission which they already have and are expecting to open for business at Easter this year. The site is therefore not available for this purpose
	There must be suitable brown field/previous industrial sites in Kenilworth	There are no sites currently available or suitable for consideration. Sites for Gypsies

		and Travellers should be located on the edge of towns and villages with facilities and services in close proximity, but not in the middle of the urban area
	Expand Harbury Lane site instead	Government guidelines indicate that a site of 15 pitches should be considered the maximum to reduce the issues associated with the management and maintenance of large sites
<b>Support:</b>		
	Proposed allocation at Stratford Road is supported	
	<p>Homeless Gypsy families are in desperate need of accommodation. If the Council should be making the site at Stratford North available they would wish to have the opportunity to live on this land, and enter into negotiations with the Council. The land designated for industrial use should possibly be changed to enable the Council to facilitate this rather than the land being identified as for use as a Gypsy Site in its consultation being in private ownership. The site might not be ideal, however, currently it is all that is available. They are unable to identify alternative affordable land on which they can live.</p> <p>There needs to be a fair resolution to the problem caused by there being a lack of accommodation for the Gypsy / Traveller community</p>	
	It provides a location with appropriate proximity to services, good site access, proximity to the major road network and is located in a situation which can be adequately screened and will therefore have minimal landscape impact. It is also a deliverable site.	
	Good access to services, good site access and close to major routes. It will hopefully have minimal impact on a minimal number of settled residents and therefore should be more a more	

	harmonious site than the vast majority of previously suggested sites	
	Close to all that they need. More sites like this are needed	
	Taking all factors into account, accept that the proposed site is the best option	
	<p>This is the best site put forward yet.</p> <p>The other two sites at Europa Way and Harbury Lane should be added to this and a larger site provided at Longbridge under the control of the Council and not outside commercial bodies.</p> <p>Travellers should not be 'dumped' out in the countryside; they are not part of it any more than urban dwellers.</p> <p>It is further from other houses than any other sites</p>	
	<p>It has all the pitches for them.</p> <p>Shops close by for what they need.</p> <p>Land can be controlled by WDC.</p> <p>Screened</p>	