

Report on the outcomes of Public Consultation Options 2014

1. Introduction
 - 1.1. This report has been prepared to provide a summary of the representations made in relation to the 2014 Gypsy and Traveller Sites Preferred Options consultation.
 - 1.2. The outcomes from this consultation have been used to help shape the Council's 2014 Draft Publication Gypsy and Traveller Sites document.
 - 1.3. The tables in this report summarise the representations received on the preferred options sites and other comments/questions. These other comments are rebutted by the Council or questions answered.
 - 1.4. Full details of the representations received in relation to this consultation are available on the Warwick District Council website at Gypsy and Traveller Site Options Consultation
2. Consultation Representations Statistics
 - 2.1. The table below provides a summary of the 955 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 individual representations received, the Council has received one petition. It was signed by 485 people. The petition was: Opposing Site GT12, Land north of Westham Lane, Barford
Signatures were collected by Barford Residents Association
Reasons for opposing the site:
 - The nearest GP surgery is 4.4 miles away in Bishops Tachbrook and is not easily accessible from Barford
 - The site is adjacent to the busy, derestricted, fast moving Barford by-pass (design speed of 60mph and a history of traffic accidents) – access would be difficult and expensive to achieve whilst remaining potentially very dangerous for vehicle users and pedestrians alike
 - The site is narrow and continuous noise from the Barford by-pass would be unacceptable and could not be reduced effectively or economically by constructing barriers
 - There are no services available in the area so the cost overhead for supplying these for a small number of pitches would be considerable and render the site uneconomic
 - The impact on landscape and tourism of a Gypsy and Traveller site on this busy route between the historic town of Warwick and the rural Cotswolds would be severe
 - The A429 Barford by-pass isolates the site from the village and presents a physical barrier to integration with the village

The following table relates to the sites and areas of search which were published in the Preferred Options for Sites for Gypsies and Travellers consultation paper in March 2014.

Representation Summaries for Specific Sites

Site Ref:	Site	Comments	Response
Green Sites			
GT02	Land abutting the Fosse Way close to its junction with the A425	<p>Objection: Does not satisfy the criteria for reasons of safety; flood risk; Prone to flooding as it is clay based</p> <p>local health care; GP surgery will require additional funding if it is to cope with any extra demand</p> <p>local education facilities; school is full, children will have to go to Leamington</p> <p>Environmental concerns</p> <p>Other sites would not require compulsory purchase which should be last resort and these sites should be afforded more weight</p>	<p>The site has been reduced considerably in size to take account of areas that flood. A flood risk assessment may be required as part of a planning application</p> <p>This is potentially the case for all sites</p> <p>The advice of the education authority (WCC) is that the numbers are likely to be relatively low and with new development and new schools through the Local Plan, there should be sufficient places available even if this means no longer taking children from 'out of area'</p> <p>Environmental factors will be taken into account and weighed against all other factors to find the least harmful solution and will be addressed at the time of a planning application</p> <p>Compulsory purchase would be a last resort and sites which are potentially available as owners are willing to consider selling land or implementing this use will take precedence</p> <p>Previous responses were reported and</p>

		<p>Previous responses not taken into consideration Over 700 objections to this site but they have been ignored or downgraded because many people used a standard letter of objection. The number of objections should count. During first Consultation 701 objections submitted. Would like these objections noted at this stage</p> <p>Adjacent to Roman road, with high probability of archaeological interest Land is historic toll site</p> <p>Adjacent to protected ancient woodland with badger sett, along with the presence of pipistrelle bats and a honey buzzard nest, owls, sparrow hawks, woodpeckers, great crested newts and a variety of deer naturalised in the wood Additionally there are two natural pond areas containing various reptiles including adders, grass snakes, frogs, toads, aquatic insects and newts. Impact on wildlife habitat. Development will damage wildlife habitat at a time when many species are declining in numbers. Sporting shoots around the wood area pose a danger to anyone inhabiting the surrounding land Area already listed for special nature conservation and historical interest Development will damage the local wildlife</p> <p>Lies within a valley and is highly visible from 3 directions Site is overlooked by Ufton, Leamington and Harbury and will have a detrimental</p>	<p>taken into account before this next stage was reached, however, public opinion is one of the factors to be taken into account and balanced against others The number of objections, whilst noted, is not as important as the quality of the planning arguments contained therein. It would be unfair to take numbers into account where smaller communities may not have the same number of residents to mobilise for example which would put them at a disadvantage over larger or more organised communities</p> <p>The advice of the Archaeological team at WCC has been sought on such matters</p> <p>Steps would need to be taken to ensure minimum disruption to the woodland (which is protected) and wildlife, some of which are protected species</p> <p>Careful landscaping of any future site would be required and would be dealt with as part of a planning</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>effect on the landscape. Due to the elevation of the land around it, it will not be possible to screen the site</p> <p>No sustainable public transport connection – therefore no amenities accessible</p> <p>Fosse Way is Red Risk route with high likelihood of road accident – additional housing increases risk</p> <p>Owners do not wish to sell</p> <p>Moving the area of search away from Warwickshire Exhibition Centre does not mitigate the impact on this business – no assessment made of effect on employment Councillors agreed business impact be recognised as new criteria, it is not apparent how this can be introduced into new consultation unless further consultation undertaken - development will lead to closure of a 'unique' business with impact on local businesses/economy Impact of redundancy at Exhibition Centre particularly difficult given rural employment situation Threat alone has deterred potential event organisers Clients and potential clients need to know what impact this will have on the venue's ability to service their event, especially as they need all the surrounding land for their parking and event operations The Enfusion (SA) report simply could not ascertain the effect on the local economy of the proposed site yet naming an active and thriving business will affect it and the local economy. Fail to understand why the economic importance of the proposed site has never been evaluated or understood properly by anyone involved in this process Given the nature of the crops, good quality growing land close to the business is vital. The land in question is grade 3-4 agricultural land, but is under-graded and</p>	<p>application</p> <p>As is the case in many more rural locations, public transport is not always available/convenient and local residents are more likely to rely on their own private transport to access amenities/services</p> <p>The advice of the highway authority (WCC) has been taken on this and guidelines have been provided</p> <p>The majority of site owners do not wish to sell, which is why the Council is contemplating the need for CPO</p> <p>The District has business users in all areas, including farmers for example, and any site will potentially have an impact on a business or businesses. It is unfair to single out one particular business as more important than others and therefore in need of a different approach</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>provides well drained fertile land, well sheltered and a good structure. It enables all year round production. The business employs around 42 workers for local area.</p> <p>The proposal would make the entrance to the business unworkable and dangerous (fast road and slow moving vehicles). The proposal could have a serious impact on the business with the loss of employment, revenue and food.</p> <p>Opposite a business but also a residential home</p> <p>Current site owners/dwellers denied planning permission for business use of the land. Granting travellers the right to set up a business is not right or proper. This could include contamination and industrial uses</p> <p>There is no separate provision for pedestrians or cyclists. Thus, no safe access to Harbury School without exacerbating parking and obstruction problems at the school</p> <p>Poor vehicular access and poor access to good infrastructure</p> <p>Green Belt land and will directly affect the Green Belt</p> <p>No evidence that Gypsies and travellers would be willing to pay the costs involved and council have not suggested an alternative means of raising the revenue required</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Wherever sites are located, there will be businesses and residential property within close proximity as sites need to be located close to services and other communities. In a district like this there are few places that are truly remote from either</p> <p>There are many reasons why planning permission may be denied or indeed granted. Not all Travellers will wish to have business use on their site. This will be taken into account when a planning application is submitted, as will the individual site characteristics</p> <p>Children will not necessarily attend Harbury School. It is not envisaged that they will, but this is an issue which may need addressing</p> <p>The advice of the highway authority (WCC) has been taken on this and guidelines have been provided</p> <p>This site is not in or adjacent to the Green Belt</p> <p>There are funding channels open for the provision of Gypsy and Travellers sites which would assist in</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>The site would not promote peaceful and integrated co-existence between the site and the local community. The local community would be dominated by the gypsies and travellers</p> <p>Since first consultation Stratford District Council has given approval for G & T site (temporary stays only) on land just outside Southam.</p> <p>Ufton is very small village to become a frequently used thoroughfare by the travelling community, in addition to heavy lorries travelling to Biffa waste tip and green waste recycling facility just outside village plus inevitable major disruption the construction of HS2 will bring</p> <p>Lit footpath would be required by WCC into Radford Semele to provide safe pedestrian access but verge too narrow in places</p> <p>Danger to animals from flooding/contamination of watercourses Potential ponding of effluent from septic tank(s)</p> <p>No mains services: mains power supply would need to be upgraded.</p> <p>Quiet area of countryside would be destroyed</p>	<p>the set-up costs. The Council however would not consider spending any money on this provision</p> <p>This is less to do with location and more to do with community acceptance</p> <p>It was explained in the document that formed the basis of the consultation that WCC will provide transit places for Warwickshire. This is one of the sites it proposed to fulfil that need</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This would have to be considered as part of a planning application and steps taken to ensure that contamination was guarded against</p> <p>Because of the location of sites beyond the serviced villages and urban areas, mains services would need to be provided where possible on sites, but also other methods of supply considered</p> <p>There is no reason to consider that this might be the case for this type of development any more than any other</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Site is very close to isolated property</p> <p>Evidence (GTAA and SA flawed). Landscape Sensitivity and Ecological & Geological Study have been ignored and there is a lack of fairness in the entire process, especially the Green/Amber/Red ratings which are unbalanced</p> <p>Breeding of alpacas and rare pigs will be affected</p> <p>Monitoring arrangements for the site are unknown</p> <p>The SA is lacking detail and is inaccurate</p> <p>Support: Few locals impacted Close to roundabout on derestricted road with slow traffic Not prominent in landscape Agricultural land less valuable than other</p>	<p>In order to provide both the settled community and the Traveller community with the separation they want, yet still maintain a link, it is necessary to locate sites close to more rural areas. This will mean that some more isolated properties are likely to be nearby</p> <p>The evidence for the numbers of pitches required and the sustainability factors, including landscape studies etc. has been provided by independent external consultants. The evidence has been used as the basis for the choice of potential sites. Rating sites according to the 'traffic light' system is a simplistic form of illustration it is agreed, but one which is easily understood. More detailed analysis is also available to explain the way that these ratings have been attributed in the site assessments available on the Council's website</p> <p>There is no reason for new developments to have such an impact</p> <p>The Draft Local Plan outlines the monitoring strategy for all new development</p> <p>An update will be provided at the next stage for those sites allocated</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>sites e.g. Barford Services available within 3 miles Could take maximum site numbers acceptable (15) Public protest at earlier stages was out of proportion to impact Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low-medium. Consider it an ideal site It is a large tract of land and maybe it would be possible to buy just a part of it for a gypsy and traveller site? On preferred route of Gypsies Does not impact on wider local community This is a good site, why has it been overlooked? Excellent access is possible and minimal impact on settled population. Could take 15 pitches. Traffic issues minimal as traffic is slowed by roundabout. Services adequate at Radford Semele and Harbury Best 'non major development' site. Low profile in landscape could take 15 pitches and impact relatively few nearby residents. Within acceptable distance from facilities and road access is achievable given it is adjacent to A425/Fosse Way roundabout and hence whilst there are significant traffic volumes they will be at acceptable speeds Believe Travellers would like this site – interested in Traveller feedback No impact on Green Belt</p> <p>Comment: Potential to indirectly affect neighbouring local wildlife sites (including potential sites) and should be avoided. If, through SA, you determine that these sites are in most sustainable locations and remain allocated, mitigation measures which preserve/enhance their wildlife interest should be identified Already has access to major route popular with Travellers</p>	
<p>GT04</p>	<p>Land at Harbury Lane/Fosse Way</p>	<p>Objection: Does not satisfy the criteria for reasons of safety; flood risk;</p> <p>local health care; surgery will require additional funding if it is to cope with any extra demand</p> <p>local education facilities; school is full, children will have to go to Leamington</p>	<p>The site has been reduced considerably in size to take account of areas that flood</p> <p>This is potentially the case for all sites</p> <p>The advice of the education authority (WCC) is that the numbers are likely to be relatively low and with new development and new schools</p>

		<p>Environmental concerns On fault line</p> <p>Assumption that Bishop's Itchington has/will have spare education (nursery and primary school) places and local GP surgery provision. Additional proposed housing will add pressure Assume residents will come to Harbury school and doctor's surgery. Both over subscribed Pressure from new developments in Harbury</p> <p>Stratford district would have to fund educational/health needs</p> <p>No local amenities within a reasonable walking distance</p> <p>No connection to mains sewerage/gas/drainage, telecommunications poor</p> <p>Lack of pavements - there is no separate</p>	<p>through the Local Plan, there should be sufficient places available even if this means no longer taking children from 'out of area'</p> <p>Environmental factors will be taken into account and weighed against all other factors to find the least harmful solution and will be addressed at the time of a planning application</p> <p>The advice of the education authority (WCC) is that the numbers are likely to be relatively low and with new development and new schools through the Local Plan, there should be sufficient places available even if this means no longer taking children from 'out of area' There is no assumption that children will attend Harbury School or utilise the local GP surgery</p> <p>Since the education and health funding is not based at a district level, this will make no difference</p> <p>The site is not far beyond the urban outer limits and new development on Harbury Lane together with new amenities is envisaged in the Local Plan which will bring such facilities closer to the site. It is also on a bus route into the urban area</p> <p>Because of the location of sites beyond the serviced villages and urban areas, mains services</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>provision for pedestrians or cyclists</p> <p>No street lighting</p> <p>Not ideal for public transport access</p> <p>Nearest schools/GP surgeries are at least a 45 minute walk away (3 miles) and are at capacity</p> <p>No shops in Ufton</p> <p>Roads hazardous. Increase in traffic due to expansion of Jaguar Land Rover, and potential development of housing in close proximity will exacerbate</p> <p>Travellers at risk crossing dangerous crossroads to school/GP</p> <p>Provision of a footpath would be expensive/impractical because of narrow width of road</p> <p>Areas at risk of flooding along Fosse Way/Harbury Lane. Land has flooded on occasion and slow to clear as clay based soil. A raised site would be detrimental to the environment. Full flood risk assessment is required Pollution from the site is likely to damage local wildlife, grazing livestock and be a health hazard</p> <p>In sight line from Chesterton Windmill</p> <p>Barnwell Farm not named as preferred sites, where majority of reasons for non-selection replicated Odours from chicken farm and associated health issues</p> <p>Highly questionable whether the football club would be better off on a new site;</p>	<p>would need to be provided where possible on sites, but also other methods of supply considered. Mains/other services provided as part of the new developments mentioned above will also be available Noted</p> <p>The advice of the highway authority (WCC) has been taken on this and guidelines have been provided. Additionally, all new developments will provide the opportunity to improve both traffic flows and safety</p> <p>The site has been reduced considerably in size to take account of areas that flood. A flood risk assessment may be required as part of a planning application</p> <p>A full assessment would be required at the time of a planning application taking into account the exact location of pitches and any mitigation</p> <p>All factors are taken into account when the decision is made as to which sites progress, but those associated with Barnwell Farm and the immediate area around it could not be overcome. In this case, there are reasons why some of these issues can be overcome – reducing the area of the site for example, and therefore fewer reasons to omit it</p> <p>These are issues which the football club</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>cost of new site; cost of providing facilities as good as those currently on site Require the re-location of a football club and will not be cost effective Club delivers benefits to community, charities and economy of the towns. Do not wish to lose the club or those benefits. Would take an important community amenity away from Whitnash and its residents After losing the Old Windmill Ground to developers, to now lose the NWG would be a disaster after all the work the fans and supporters have put in to the transformation of that ground Urge the Council to reconsider the proposal unless a satisfactory new ground can be found and transformed to allow continuity of play Local people who support the team would have to travel further, thus increasing traffic levels Leamington FC will need to be relocated and its history tarnished Interim ground sharing would not be possible if the Club wants to keep its current status within the football pyramid Land is subject to a covenant that it shall not be used other than as a sports ground with ancillary facilities Football club has been looking for an alternative site for a while without success</p> <p>In close proximity of Harbury Lane breakers yard and Barnwell chicken farm and will be subject to associated pollution</p> <p>Site is inconsistent with the guidance set out in the 'Noise' and 'Air Quality' sections of the PPGS</p> <p>Breakers Yard operates seven days a week. Barnwell Farm operates 'phased' cyclical processing which generates a high number of traffic movements (166 in total) per cycle. Each cycle is unrestricted and can take place at any time of the day or night, 7 days a week. Majority of movements take place during the night, which may give rise to residential amenity noise In addition, automated feed, heating and ventilation systems are in operation 24 hours a day with potential noise disturbance</p> <p>Will utilise quality farmland. Site is good quality farmland fully utilised for livestock and arable farming</p>	<p>will decide. It is not the Council's intention to worsen the facilities which the club currently enjoys, force the club to share a ground or indeed prevent the club from continuing. Any future ground will be agreed by both parties. Any new ground and facilities would be within Warwick District and would offer at least comparable if not improved facilities. Any covenants would need to be addressed through our legal representatives. The Council is working closely with the club to find a new location</p> <p>Environmental health officers have advised that there have been no issues with regard to the smells emanating from the chicken farm operation but that an odour assessment should be commissioned for the site. Similarly, a noise assessment is required and checks made as to the authorised use of the adjacent business</p> <p>The current use on the land remaining under consideration is a football ground and</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Danger to sheep and horses grazing on neighbouring land Will damage habitat / wildlife</p> <p>Will prejudice the landscape</p> <p>Not set within an existing residential/agricultural built form context, it is considered that proposed use would have adverse impact upon the character of the landscape, appearing as an incongruous feature in the countryside</p> <p>Will have a detrimental impact on tourism and visitors (especially Mallory Court Hotel Listed Building and garden) Will damage reputation of Mallory Court Hotel thus harming local business/economy. The viability of future investment will be threatened (including the Spa)</p> <p>Villagers and the traveller community will not be able to integrate and as such the breakdown of the current harmonious community will be lost Site is not on community periphery to encourage integration</p> <p>Establishing 5-10 pitches would be disproportionate to the local community</p> <p>Consultation process has focussed on gypsies and travellers' views not those of the settled communities</p> <p>Council have changed definition of the</p>	<p>therefore no existing agricultural land would be lost</p> <p>There is no reason to think that this will be the case but would be assessed at the time of a planning application</p> <p>With a proper landscaping scheme in place and conditioned as part of a planning permission there is no reason why the site couldn't integrate well into the existing landscape</p> <p>See above and the hotel is over a mile and a half away</p> <p>There is no reason why integration cannot take place with a gap between communities (which is what both communities seem to want), but it is largely down to those communities to address this issue</p> <p>This is difficult since guidance does not offer a definition of 'local community', however, it is considered that this site is close to the larger urban area and is therefore not disproportionate</p> <p>There are other consultation responses which state the opposite to be the case. We have listened to both the settled and Traveller communities</p> <p>The sites have been</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>site to ensure some arguments are overlooked e.g. revised site has been cherry picked to cover only the part that does not lie in the flood plain. This approach has not been afforded to any other proposed site with flood considerations. Various sites mention potential road noise from the A46 and M40, yet the Fosse Way (which is adjacent to the GT04 site) is one of the busiest roads in the area. There are many other examples of such inconsistencies. the biggest irregularities focus on Gtalt02, which is marked as 'amber' but many of its 'disadvantages' also relate to this site but are not mentioned</p> <p>Small stream which is a tributary from the River Leam has been subject to flooding</p> <p>Site is on the WDC and Stratford DC boundary and any implication and effects of this site will cross this boundary leading to inefficiencies and ineffectiveness of response</p> <p>Residential planning applications within 200m of site have been rejected on the grounds that the proposal would have an adverse "impact on the character of the area"</p> <p>No firm evidence that gypsies and travellers can or will pay the sums of money involved. Council has not suggested an alternative means of raising the revenue required Cost to create 5 - 10 permanent pitches ranges between £352K and £650K, using government figures (£65K per pitch). Additionally, the Football club would have to be resited. Due to the recent history of Government and Local Council cuts do not believe there is any evidence that this can be achieved. If Travellers are purchasing this site why therefore should these funds be used for the development of the site Council should not fund the relocation of the Football Club in the event of a compulsory purchase. This does not represent good taxpayer value</p>	<p>reduced in area where there has been found to be good reason to do so by way of constraints, flooding being one of these since building a site on a flood plain would be unacceptable. Noise levels from roads depends very much on the road use, the amount of traffic and type of traffic and prevailing winds as well as other factors such as the time of day. We have received advice on where the noise levels could be an issue and have taken these into account</p> <p>The Council has worked with adjoining authorities and consulted them on the site locations. All adjoining districts are therefore aware of the location of our Preferred Options sites and any impact that there could be on their district</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>There are funding channels open for the provision of Gypsy and Travellers sites which would assist in the set-up costs. The Council however would not consider spending on this provision. Any Travellers wishing to set up a site would do so at their own cost</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Detrimental impact on tourism and a consequential effect on local employment</p> <p>Detrimental impact on wildlife habitat</p> <p>Consultation is taking place on the flawed premise that the club is a willing vendor Site is not available now and cannot realistically be delivered within the timescale of 2017</p> <p>Many of the reasons for not selecting GT03, namely the presence of gas pipes, access issues, distance to GP surgeries, schools, dentists, hospitals, shops, community facilities, road noise from Harbury Lane and Fosse Way) are replicated for this site. Also both sites are subjected to the same odours emanating from the chicken farm Scale of proposed development (32-64 individuals) is grossly disproportionate to the local community and therefore contradictory to the NPPF & PPFTS guidelines and recommendations</p> <p>Would scare away birds of prey and Muntjac deer</p> <p>There are long-established houses, and a successful business (the Fosse Garage) on the site</p> <p>Travel from this site into local towns and villages will cause disruption</p> <p>Better sites available near to centre of Warwick</p> <p>Some of the issues raised in previous consultation have not been included or have been only selectively referenced</p>	<p>There is no evidence to suggest that this would be the case</p> <p>This would be assessed at the time of a planning application</p> <p>The Council has not been given this impression</p> <p>It is agreed that some of the reasons are the same, but on balance GT03 is far less able to be developed, largely because of the location and dimensions of the gas pipeline which has less of an effect on this site, particularly now that only the football ground is under consideration</p> <p>This would be assessed at the time of a planning application</p> <p>The site area has been reduced to just that of the football club and therefore houses and businesses are no longer on the site</p> <p>This is thought to be minimal especially when improvements can be made through the new developments proposed in the Local Plan</p> <p>Alternative suggested sites were requested but none nearer Warwick have been promoted</p> <p>The flavour of all comments has been reported although the detail has not since this would make the report far longer than</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>GT04 would deliver residential development that is unsuitable for, incompatible with and inappropriate in its proposed location</p> <p>The overarching aim of CLG's 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites' (March 2012) is to "ensure fair and equal treatment for travellers". The guidance clearly states that the objective is to "increase the number of traveller sites in appropriate locations" This site is in a wholly inappropriate location for any residential occupation (irrespective of whether it is for permanent housing or traveller accommodation</p> <p>Permitting the permanent siting of pitches in this location would not deliver fair or equal treatment to Travellers residing at the site</p> <p>Site is in direct conflict with Paragraphs 3.3 and 3.6 to 3.12 of guidance contained within the Government's good practice guide: 'Designing Gypsy and Traveller Sites' on selecting appropriate locations for sites. Paragraph 3.6 states that "sites should not be identified for Gypsy and Traveller use in locations that are inappropriate for ordinary residential dwellings, unless exceptional circumstances apply. These circumstances would be where the location is unsuitable for housing, for practical and technical reasons which would not adversely affect the health and safety of Gypsy and Traveller residents or the sustainability of the site."</p> <p>Contrary to the Warwick Sustainable Community Strategy as it offers sporting/leisure opportunities and potentially helps reduce anti-social behaviour</p> <p>Will Council tax payer be granted a reduction?</p> <p>Used as shared parking facility</p>	<p>it is. All major and popular issues have been raised and addressed</p> <p>What are the criteria by which this assumption has been made</p> <p>See above This would be an issue for the Travellers themselves to decide when considering whether or not to live there</p> <p>This has not been tested out through a planning application so it is not considered that the site would necessarily be unsuitable for residential dwellings</p> <p>These facilities are not being considered for removal, just for relocation and will therefore not lose any benefits</p> <p>This is not a planning issue but should be taken up with the relevant department</p> <p>Alternative arrangements would have to be made</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>If club relocated land should be returned to agriculture</p> <p>Farmland fully utilised for livestock and arable farming</p> <p>Why not use existing site at Ryton</p> <p>Unappealing to Gypsies so unlikely to be used</p> <p>There is already a Gypsy site on Banbury Road approaching Warwick, surely this is the sensible option</p> <p>Sport England would object unless NPPF para. 74 is adhered to</p> <p>Large number of people opposed site in the first consultation so shouldn't have proceeded</p> <p>Support: Meets many of the criteria in para. 6; and</p>	<p>This would mean that a development opportunity would be lost with consequences for other agricultural land</p> <p>The farmland has been taken out of the site and the area reduced to just that covered by the football club</p> <p>The site at Ryton is in two ownerships: part belongs to Rugby Borough Council (it is within their boundary) and the other is privately owned. Neither Rugby BC or Warwick DC have control over who purchases/rents on the private site. There are no vacancies on the part owned by Rugby BC and there is a waiting list for pitches there. Any vacancies that do arise will be to serve Rugby's need</p> <p>There are a number of families interested in this site</p> <p>This is a site with planning permission for holiday caravans and appears in this document as GTalt01</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>We received a large number of objections to all sites. The number of consultation responses is not as important as the planning content of the observations contained therein. The public consultation results are one element in the overall analysis</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>within that larger extent a suitable site could be identified, probably with access onto the Fosse Way</p> <p>Support the use of part of this site north of the existing Football Club premises with a separate access to Harbury Lane, surrounded by shelter belt tree planting for a maximum of 6 pitches under the direction of a specialist housing association. This would not require relocation of football club to another location, safeguarding that site for housing required to meet the Local Plan targets</p> <p>Will become available when the football club moves.</p> <p>Minimal impact on residents.</p> <p>Services available within 3 miles.</p> <p>Harbury Lane whilst busy is accessible as demonstrated by current site use and others on the road</p> <p>Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low once the site is vacated</p> <p>Everything is provided on the site</p> <p>Land owner willing to sell</p> <p>Large area</p> <p>Good location with easy access away from residential areas but with potential to be linked to new residential development and associated facilities.</p> <p>Needs screening, possibly with new woodland along the north-east boundary to improve the situation for Leamington Hall Farm</p> <p>Does not impact on village with just a few farms around it</p> <p>In slight dip so less obvious</p> <p>Well located with easy access to public transport and nearby amenities in Harbury</p> <p>Very good site on most criteria and impacts very few residents. Every assistance should be given to FC to achieve move</p> <p>Could take 15 pitches if WDC change 5-10 restriction</p> <p>Landscape character already has similar uses so impact would be low</p> <p>Good road network</p> <p>Safe access</p> <p>Previously developed site</p> <p>Topography and size suitable</p> <p>Not near to river</p> <p>No proximity to archaeological assets</p> <p>Set amidst agricultural land so less likely to impact residential development</p> <p>Fosse Way is quieter than A429</p> <p>Countryside is less scenic and would impact less on environment</p> <p>Access road already handles football club traffic and G&T traffic will be less</p> <p>Comment:</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Unlikely to significantly affect any internationally designated sites or significantly harm nationally designated SSSIs</p> <p>If GT04 is adopted then think Section 106 monies should be used to fund the installation of traffic lights at the Fosse Way/Harbury Lane junction</p> <p>Location is supported but not the exact site, which is an exposed position not easily screened. Support site on map extract for GT04 called 'Hobson's Choice', which is surrounded by a high earth bund, and is used for container storage. Would be very suitable for up to 15 pitches and would have no adverse effect on the surrounding environment. The container storage activity need not be at this location and industrial land for it could be found elsewhere</p> <p>Using this site would have the benefit of providing the football club with better facilities that are more appropriate for its status. It could possibly be incorporated into the expansion of South Whitnash</p> <p>Is there the possibility of using innovative low carbon decentralised energy solution?</p>	
GT05	Land at Tachbrook Hill Farm	<p>Object:</p> <p>Bordered on two sides by main roads: M40 and A452 with accompanying noise pollution/congestion</p> <p>Fast 50mph road</p> <p>Accident black spot</p> <p>Towing vehicles would increase dangers at road junction</p> <p>Access issues - already difficulty to exit village on A452. More vehicles/access would exacerbate problems</p> <p>Too close to the motorway and the traffic noise particularly at night, or the wrong cloud base level, is high</p> <p>Too many vehicles use the village as a short cut to Leamington Spa and the volume of traffic coming out of the village to the motorway is likely to become even worse than at present given plans to build on agricultural land at the other end of the village</p> <p>Main road into village already dangerous. Exits would be dangerous. All roads busy around village at commuter times. Busy junction. History of accidents. Presence of the police speed camera van at the site of this junction is further demonstration that this is an accident black spot. Data needs to be collected and utilised</p> <p>Access from farmers drive is a blind spot at the brow of the hill so very dangerous for pulling out of and turning into</p> <p>Rural location makes any junction widening or lighting highly damaging to the character of the immediate area</p>	<p>The highways authority (WCC) considers that there is no existing access which would be acceptable and a new access would be required assuming that the required visibility splays could be achieved</p>

		<p>Constructing infrastructure to provide access onto Banbury Road will require the removal of a number of mature oak trees and impact on some of the most ecologically valuable features of the land</p> <p>Socio-economic and environmental impacts</p> <p>Flooding issues on Mallory Road; alterations to local drainage system would be needed. Classed as low risk Flood Zone 1 yet has been section of field under water. Ditches at edges of field frequently flood over onto road</p> <p>Field floods, also an issue in gardens</p> <p>Prone to flooding in bad weather which would cause danger with water and mud running down to the A452 junction towards village</p> <p>Tachbrook Hill Farm is a listed building</p> <p>Barn north of farm is listed building so is part of historic context</p> <p>Proximity to village incompatible with Travellers wanting to live apart from settled community</p> <p>Small village facilities-part time GP surgery, single form entry primary school both already oversubscribed; impact on class sizes</p> <p>Giving transient gypsy and traveller children priority would disadvantage permanent residents of the village</p> <p>Single form entry school - and supporting a temporary population would mean school places might be taken up for the year and the children leave days / weeks later while local children cannot get a place</p> <p>Site is close to Bishops Tachbrook school</p> <p>Can school facilitate the children and any special needs alongside the new housing developments? Reputation damage to school</p>	<p>This would need to be assessed when an access is considered in consultation with the tree officer and WCC highways officers as would any other potential environmental impacts</p> <p>This would be assessed at the time of a planning application and remediation would need to be put in place to deal with any additional run-off caused by new development</p> <p>It is the barn that is the listed building and as part of the group of farm buildings set away from the boundary with the larger area of search, the setting of the barn is likely to remain unaffected</p> <p>Apart but within easy distance of facilities</p> <p>School places would be allocated as now and would be given to children closest to the school. If demand outstripped supply, the education authority may decide to deny places to out of area children. Traveller children would be unlikely to leave the school for periods of time since they would be permanently housed on the site in the same way as if they were living in a house. It is for the education authority to decide what if any additional facilities may be needed as part of the overall increased need</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Only one shop to serve village</p> <p>Local recreational clubs are also full</p> <p>High visual impact on hillside; insufficient screening; unpleasant on approach to Warwick/Bishops Tachbrook/Leamington The WCC Landscape Sensitivity, Ecology & Geological Report for the New Local Plan assessed the landscape sensitivity as High Impact on visual amenity when travelling south on the Banbury Road. No existing adequate screening to the site, new planting will take years to mature Disastrous effect on the rural landscape adjacent to the village</p> <p>Noise generated from site; impact on village residents Village residents were compensated for noise pollution due to siting of M40. This is closer and caravans are more noise vulnerable</p> <p>Loss of grade 2 agricultural land/open countryside Economic viability of the farm could be compromised Increased animal activity</p> <p>Too close to houses Too close to existing properties in Holt Avenue Too much of a vast open space</p>	<p>for all new developments, but new schools are proposed as part of the development sites to the south of Warwick, Leamington and Whitnash</p> <p>This is a local facility and more customers may increase the need for the shop and other facilities making them more sustainable</p> <p>The exact location and the landscaping scheme to provide screening etc. would form part of a planning application when these issues would be further considered</p> <p>This is unlikely to be any more than any other residential development. A noise assessment would be required for the road noise and its impact on caravan dwellers</p> <p>This needs to be assessed against the need for homes and lack of other suitable sites</p> <p>There are no houses immediately adjacent to the site and the site needs to be within easy reach of services which are within residential areas so it is inevitable that sites will be close to houses in many cases The size of the actual site has not been determined at this stage and would depend on finding the best location and access point. Not all of</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>No mains services</p> <p>No footpath to school/GP etc.</p> <p>Not suitable for business use</p> <p>Only 10 minute walk from Oakley Wood (via wide verge) and crematorium and opposite guide dogs breeding centre so not well located Oakley Wood could be damaged due to proximity with the site</p> <p>Potential risk to wildlife Proximity to habitat for great crested newts</p> <p>Compulsory purchase would be required/cost to taxpayer Land owner very reluctant to sell land - compulsory purchase would be a protracted process Any CPO will be resisted. The site is adjacent to the farmhouse and therefore particularly important during the lambing season</p> <p>Not a level site</p>	<p>this land is required</p> <p>Because of the location of sites beyond the serviced villages and urban areas, mains services would need to be provided where possible on sites, but also other methods of supply considered. The mains/other services provided as part of the new developments mentioned above will also be available</p> <p>Not all sites will require business use dependent upon the individual needs of the families involved. This will be considered, if requested, at the time of a planning application</p> <p>There are some sensitive uses close by but all more than 0.5 miles away There is no reason to think that the wood would be damaged, but this would have to be taken into account at the time of a planning application</p> <p>This would be considered at the time of a planning application</p> <p>This may be the only way to ensure that land is provided for this use</p> <p>This need not be a problem provided that the services can still be provided and pitches are level</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>No bus route</p> <p>Size out of proportion with village</p> <p>Housing developments have to comply with rules in order to be sympathetic to the location; not the case with settlements of static /moveable caravans etc., which seems to be a case of double-standards Would result in the death of Bishops Tachbrook</p> <p>Villagers and the traveller community will not be able to integrate and as such the breakdown of the current harmonious community will be lost</p> <p>Residential planning permission refused previously on next field due to way land lies that can be seen from Warwick Gates. Same applies here</p> <p>Consider peoples personal opinions/impacts</p> <p>By allocating this land for travellers, few settled people could be housed and current planning application jeopardised</p>	<p>A bus route (77 service) runs along the two roadside boundaries</p> <p>There were 1021 households in Bishops Tachbrook according to the 2011 Census. Adding another 15 maximum households does not seem out of proportion</p> <p>Details of design and layout would be addressed at the planning application stage; there is however no reason why this type of development cannot be sympathetic to location in the same way that any other development can</p> <p>There is no reason why integration cannot take place with a gap between communities (which is what both communities seem to want), but it largely down to those communities to address this issue</p> <p>The situation is not quite the same since houses tend to be two and three storeys in height whereas caravans and mobile homes are only single storey, however an assessment of the impact of a detailed scheme would be made at the time of a planning application</p> <p>That is partly what the consultation is seeking to do as well as collecting other information and views</p> <p>This land is not affected by a planning application or allocation for</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Represents one of the least economic sites to develop As these sites are being provisioned using the tax payers money, you have a responsibility to ensure that cost effective sites are chosen such as GTalt01</p> <p>Can all the new development proposals be considered in relation to the whole effect on the village</p> <p>Make more sense to put a settlement near to a fully-developed town or in a completely isolated area where traffic/visual impact/integration will not be an issue</p> <p>No appropriate solution found in reference to sewerage disposal. A mains connected sewer is preferable, but it is stated in the consultation document that this is "unlikely</p> <p>Locating a site in such a vast wide area is a potential for further illegal encampments. Occupancy on the pitches cannot be regulated or controlled Concern if sites are granted for a given number of pitches, the Gypsy & Travelling Community will breach Planning Policy as was the case with Dale Farm</p> <p>Availability of necessary employment for the Gypsy & Traveller Community within the Bishop's Tachbrook Village is questioned</p> <p>Known 'negatives', lack of information, uncertainties and community concern surrounding site should remove it from consideration</p> <p>Concern over water pressure</p>	<p>residential use currently</p> <p>Sites are not being provided with tax payers' money. The purchase of land, provision of services and running of the sites would be the responsibility of the Gypsies and Travellers themselves, a private landowner or social landlord</p> <p>All new development when taken as a whole will require additional services and resources and the total effect will need to be taken into account</p> <p>Ideally, mains sewers are to be preferred but where this is not possible there are other solutions available</p> <p>The whole of this site is not required and would only be located on part of the land. It would be possible to restrict the number of pitches by planning condition and any expansion would require a new planning application</p> <p>Although it is acknowledged that there was some information outstanding, the majority has been available on the Council's website for reference throughout the consultation</p> <p>Presumably an on-going issue and not directly affecting this proposal</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Public right of way skirts around edge of proposed site</p> <p>Support: Not in the Green Belt</p> <p>Comment: Unlikely to significantly affect any internationally designated sites or significantly harm nationally designated SSSIs Services in Bishops Tachbrook very close at hand Site and highway access good Probably not popular with either Barford or Bishops Tachbrook though Costs/mitigation/compensation would be medium - high</p>	<p>Noted</p>
<p>GT12</p>	<p>Land north of Westham Lane, Barford</p>	<p>Objection: Fails all the criteria set out by WDC for a suitable site Noise reduction measures would reduce the available area to less than 5 pitches making the site unviable Noise barriers would add to cost</p> <p>CPO needed and likely failure would render site undeliverable</p> <p>Long narrow site with difficult access for vans and trailers Access unsafe adjacent to A429, a very busy road with fast traffic; 60 mph limit. Larger, slower vehicles would exacerbate problems Pedestrians and schoolchildren would have to cross this road Road has poor accident record including fatalities Proximity to junction for Barford village and road to Leamington which is difficult/busy Significant flood risk Shape of site maximises visual intrusion View from the properties in Westham Lane will be dominated by a long line of unsightly developments</p> <p>Few local services available in Barford</p> <p>No GP/dentist/service station/secondary school/shops except community store</p> <p>Schools have limited resources, minimal teaching staff and tight budgets. The</p>	<p>A noise assessment will need to be carried out to determine what would be required and if this would impact on the overall pitch numbers</p> <p>CPO is a last resort however the Council has to consider this if sites are not forthcoming</p> <p>The shape of the site has been determined by the need to maintain a viable agricultural unit and a new access not taken from the by-pass. The advice of WCC highways officers has been sought with regard to the access issues for vehicles and pedestrians</p> <p>There are a number of useful services which make this an acceptable location – there is a school, pub, church, village hall and a shop School places would be allocated as now</p>

		<p>impact on existing children will be high from a transient group of pupils (especially if they have special needs). Larger town or city based schools might be better able to accommodate this influx Adverse impact on the capacity of village school</p> <p>Provision of utilities/services would not be cost effective</p> <p>Loss of prime agricultural land producing good grazing (Grade 2)</p> <p>On visitor route from Warwick to Cotswolds – effect on tourism Integration into landscape difficult</p> <p>The A429 Barford Bypass isolates the site from the village and therefore presents a physical barrier to integration with the village Site does not promote peaceful integrated co-existence with the local community</p>	<p>and would be given to children closest to the school. If demand outstripped supply, the education authority may decide to deny places to out of area children. Traveller children would be unlikely to leave the school for periods of time since they would be permanently housed on the site in the same way as if they were living in a house. It is for the education authority to decide what if any additional facilities may be needed as part of the overall increased need for all new developments, but new schools are proposed as part of the development sites to the south of Warwick, Leamington and Whitnash</p> <p>This is not known at this stage since anyone wishing to develop a site will need to gain advice on the costs involved on a site by site basis</p> <p>The site is partly grade 2 and partly grade 4. Ideally, grade 2 land would not be used for development, however, there is little else to consider since lower grades of land have already been utilised</p> <p>With the right landscaping scheme this could be achieved</p> <p>The nearest housing is on the opposite side of the by-pass or a few sporadic dwellings off Westham Lane. If located too far from other housing there is</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Cannot integrate by imposition</p> <p>Too close to existing housing</p> <p>Prevailing west wind would make it unpleasant for the occupants when pesticides are being applied or when sewage sludge is being stored and spread</p> <p>Possibility of waste material on A429 with prevailing SW wind and into River Avon 200m north of site</p> <p>Planning application and an appeal rejected for a farmhouse on land; unfair to allow the provision of accommodation and no doubt business premises for a number of families You say sites are akin to conventional housing. Planning application for housing on these sites would not be granted</p> <p>Unsuitable, undeliverable, could not be developed</p> <p>Has WDC considered building design/layout and effect on open countryside Intrusive building in open Shakespearean Countryside on edge of Historic Village Land to west of A429 is obviously and distinctly open countryside. It represents an iconic bit of River Avon valley on a distinct meander contained to west by a steep scarp. The traveller site here would be completely out of character and would intrude in open views to the west</p> <p>Site is too close to the nursery it will be impossible for the business to make itself secure from trespassers out of working hours as a great deal of stock will be out and in the open</p> <p>Barford, recently voted one of top 100 places to live in UK</p> <p>Views from A429 important and understood that modern planning considerations prevented developments sprawling beyond recognised boundaries Local plan uses A429 as boundary to justify "in filling" between village and</p>	<p>no opportunity for community integration or to access facilities</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this would be the case</p> <p>Planning applications are always decided on their individual merits and a site by site basis, however this point is noted</p> <p>Integration into open countryside would certainly present a challenge to prevent the site being too obtrusive, but this would be down to the layout and design which would be considered during a planning application</p> <p>The nursery is on the opposite side of the by-pass, so not immediately adjacent. There is no reason to believe that additional security measures are needed because there is a development nearby or that there would be a negative impact on the business</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Boundaries can however be reassessed as part of the Local Plan process and new boundaries may be drawn where</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>bypass Proposals for two sites would be an extension to that</p> <p>Utilitarian traveller site would become the face of Barford. WDC would have little or no control over the viability or performance of any landscape mitigation once it has been implemented</p> <p>WDC have disregarded their own Rural Area Policies, especially RAPs 1 (New Housing), 6 (New Employment), 10 (Safeguarding Rural Roads) and 15 (Camping and caravan Sites) Contrary to the rural area policies of the admittedly out of date Warwick District Council Local Plan, Barford Parish Plan and Barford village Design Statement</p> <p>New homes being built in Wellesbourne cannot be ignored</p> <p>Approx. 20% of site is the Barford Bypass spillage/reed ponds and the Flood Compensation/Bridge access track, making mitigation works difficult/impossible</p> <p>Noise mitigation likely to be ineffective and expensive Costs/mitigation/compensation would be high - very high</p> <p>Should be evaluated in light of CT6 Caravans & camping sites - policies and explanations - which stress the conflict of this type of development in sensitive rural locations</p> <p>Inside village conservation area</p> <p>Un-neighbourly</p> <p>Council still silent on critical issue of site</p>	<p>required to allow development to take place</p> <p>It is unlikely that landscaping would be reduced since it would be providing privacy for the residents</p> <p>These policies have been reviewed and new Draft Local Plan policies apply which carry substantial weight at this stage of the process</p> <p>Wellesbourne has its own facilities</p> <p>The exact location of the pitches would be decided though a planning application and factors such as this would need to be taken into account at that stage</p> <p>If the site were to be carried forward, it would be for the site owner to decide whether the expenditure would justify the number of pitches</p> <p>The policy clearly states that it relates to "Camping and caravan sites for holiday and recreational use". This does not apply to residential caravan sites</p> <p>The Conservation Area does not extend beyond the current built area of the village and does not include land on this side of the by-pass</p> <p>Whilst this is not ideal,</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>being on opposite side of the bypass to the village and thus separated from many of the services and facilities</p> <p>Site to the west of the A429 would not benefit from the earth bund and a fence structure to reduce noise and visual impact. It is assumed that a likely response would be to mirror the noise attenuation barrier on the eastern side of the by-pass but this would have a significant impact on views across the area to the east of the by-pass</p> <p>Air quality will also be compromised</p> <p>PPTS - sites should not be enclosed '... with so much hard landscaping, high walls or fences, that the impression may be given that the site and its occupants are deliberately isolated from the rest of the community.' This would result in the distinct isolation of this site and should therefore not be favoured as an allocation</p> <p>Little employment infrastructure, necessitating travel to towns of Wellesbourne, Stratford, Warwick, Leamington or beyond</p> <p>Important that village is not be despoiled for the interests of a small minority</p> <p>Almost essential for traveller families to be able to carry on their business from the chosen sites. But this invariably involves sprawl resulting in a much greater visual impact than merely 8 caravans. This site would not be suitable as a live/work site.</p> <p>Do not appear to have produced any evidence that this site would be viable Effect on local businesses, tourism and two farms</p>	<p>the facilities are at least in close proximity and could be accessed by those living on the other side of the by-pass</p> <p>A noise assessment would need to be undertaken to see what measures would be needed</p> <p>An air quality assessment would need to be undertaken to see what measures would be needed</p> <p>There is a difference between 'screening' with soft landscaping and natural features and 'high walls or fences'</p> <p>The same is true for any type of residential development and for the majority of the settled community</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>This is not necessarily required. It depends on the needs of individual families but not all will require to use the site for business as well as residential</p> <p>Viability is largely down to whether or not developers will develop the site. The Gypsy and Traveller community wish to purchase land and develop sites for their own occupation and those currently wishing to do so are happy to provide the necessary services</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Dogs causing problems for sheep/cattle</p> <p>New residents could clearly dominate the nearest settled community which is the Westham hamlet and change its character</p> <p>No reference to River Avon designated LWS and that otters have been recorded along this stretch of river Socio-economic and environmental impacts Residents have reported the existence of water voles in and immediately adjacent to the site Ecology impact on nesting area for corn buntings</p> <p>Not yet tackled local archaeology and site's location within a minerals safeguarding area which should not be needlessly sterilised by development</p> <p>Site area includes large drainage ditch</p> <p>Gypsies and Travellers should be encouraged to live in conventional accommodation and if they wish to travel, have caravans which can be kept in regulated caravan storage places when not in use</p>	<p>etc.</p> <p>This is a problem in any rural community and there is no reason to think that the situation will worsen above and beyond what would normally be expected if the same number of houses were to be developed</p> <p>Barford village is the nearest settled community with a few sporadic properties along Westham Lane</p> <p>The site does not include or border onto the LWS</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>This has been done since the consultation and utilised to help decide which sites will be allocated</p> <p>This would be taken into account when site layout and design are considered</p> <p>For some Gypsies and Travellers this has become an acceptable way of life. For others it is not and they wish to retain their traditional way of life. This group would no more consider living in a house permanently than someone in the settled community would consider living permanently in a caravan given that choice. It is for this group that permanent sites are needed where they have a base which is home, but from which they</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Support: Well located with easy access to public transport and nearby amenities in Barford Unlike others this site has many things going for it</p> <p>Comment: Unlikely to significantly affect any internationally designated sites or significantly harm nationally designated SSSIs</p>	<p>can travel for work, to see family and friends and to attend functions including the fairs</p>
GT15	Land east of Europa Way	<p>Objection: Heavily wooded. Was built as a permanent woodland as part of the Europa Way construction Sloping site If vegetation removed this will remove screening making site visible from road Visual impact through views created into the site from a historic footpath on the south side of the Tachbrook Valley and from the proposed country part on the northern side of the Tachbrook Valley</p> <p>Access onto dangerous road, especially in rush hour Too busy/dangerous along Europa Way for residents to walk to bus Any turning into and out of site would be dangerous between roundabouts and cause hold-ups that recent works have addressed Implementation of visibility splays would result in a loss of vegetation and will impact on the River Avon wildlife site Will proposing an access in this location be prejudicial to the proposals for dualling</p> <p>No facilities/mains services. A site able to connect to mains sewer should be preferred Limited pitch sites available relative to the infrastructure costs to give a suitable site with safe access Might be available and possible to acquire as owned by WCC but costs/mitigation/compensation are still likely to be medium Does not have easy access to utility connections and it has been stated by WDC that both HV and LV power network changes would be needed to make the site deliverable which may make the site financially unviable</p>	<p>The site would need to be well landscaped and whilst some planting would need to be removed, a scheme could include increasing the tree cover along the roadside. The slope of the site away from the road decreases the view of it</p> <p>The highways authority (WCC) considers that the existing access is acceptable and that the required visibility splays could be achieved. See above re: vegetation WCC advises that the land is not required if Europa Way is dualled</p> <p>Ideally, mains sewers are to be preferred but where this is not possible there are other solutions available Viability is largely down to whether or not developers will develop the site. The Gypsy and Traveller community wish to purchase land and develop sites for their own occupation and those currently wishing to do so are happy to provide the</p>

		<p>Potential pollution/contamination to Tach Brook from site</p> <p>Flooding</p> <p>Impact on wildlife. The site's fauna and flora will be lost and the ecological impact is unknown. Human intervention from a permanent site would remove deer, badgers and other mammals' habitat Site has ecological value and environmental issues which do not appear to have been assessed Socio-economic and environmental impacts</p> <p>Villagers and the traveller community will not be able to integrate and as such the breakdown of the current harmonious community will be lost Will not allow peaceful and integrated co-existence with the local community Remote to any other community</p> <p>Unsuitable as will only provide 4 - 5 pitches</p> <p>Too many major negative factors Key factors indicate that the site is unacceptable (national policy, ecological, topographical, service availability, sustainability) There are key elements of information missing which mitigates against the sites further inclusion as a preferred site (flooding, design potential, archaeological significance) and site (with or without further information) presents itself as unattractive to a potential developer</p>	<p>necessary services etc. New development close to the site may provide some of the new infrastructure required which could be connected to this site</p> <p>This would need to be considered at the time of a planning application</p> <p>The area shown on flood maps as being affected has been taken out of the site area</p> <p>Advice has been taken from WCC ecology team This issue would need to be considered as part of a planning application</p> <p>The site is not far from either Bishops Tachbrook, South Leamington or Warwick. There are opportunities for any/all of these communities to offer integration</p> <p>Government guidance states that sites of 5 - 15 pitches are to be preferred</p> <p>Some of these issues apply in all cases and others would need to be addressed at the time of a planning application however there do not appear to be any overriding reasons to dismiss the site as any less suitable than other non-Green Belt sites. The fact that the site is likely to be the easiest to deliver in the short-term</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Irrigation pump also used to top up fishing lakes is 20m away and noisy. Used during dry periods for most of day</p> <p>Support: If the Traveller Community has requested a site at Europa Way surely it makes common sense to grant their wish as they continue to break down barricades put in place to stop them in an attempt to gather together. These sites are set up for electric, water sewage etc. and anybody who knows the traveller community they will look after their own "patch" if it's where they want to be These large family Communities not be governed by Councils, so maybe instead of the Councillors choosing the land listen to the travellers No appropriate solution found in reference to sewerage disposal. A mains connected sewer is preferable, but it is stated in the consultation document that this is "unlikely Close to Town (Leamington and Warwick) for services Well-connected access and road network Self-contained minimum impact on others Already Council site and could be implemented quickly New local school would be attractive to children Access and egress can be made safely Would not suffer from road noise or disruption Would fit into surrounding uses Would benefit from new infrastructure for new LP developments</p> <p>Comment: Unlikely to significantly affect any internationally designated sites or significantly harm nationally designated SSSIs Screened from road but loss of woodland Close to Leamington for facilities/services WCC owned Traffic calming measures possible Minimal visual impact Steep sloping site Small site so others needed No pavements not on bus route Is there the option of the adjacent landowner releasing more land here to achieve a modest increase in the site of the site?</p> <p>Objection:</p>	<p>without needing the agreement of a private landowner also weighs in its favour</p> <p>Noted</p>

<p>GT19</p>	<p>Land off Birmingham Road, Budbrooke</p>	<p>Green Belt. Green Belt is precious and should be protected by the Council as it always has been up until now. Would 'harm' the Green Belt by reducing the degree of 'openness'. Inappropriate development. Would be prominent/visually intrusive and the recommendation of an owner is not a relevant variable in the context of Green Belt policy. Will open up 100's of potentially inappropriate sites as being a possible consideration and result in policy not being a basis for policy outcomes Councils are promoting the growth of nature by having "green areas" uncut for wildlife habitat but then want to build in the Green Belt</p> <p>Sites in the Green Belt should only be considered at all in policy terms if no other viable options are available and this does not appear to be the case.</p> <p>Government's own guidance reconfirms that in plan making and decision taking (re traveller sites) LA's should avoid inappropriate development in Green Belts. would be inappropriate, not just in policy terms but they would also 'harm' the Green Belt by reducing the degree of 'openness' referred to in the appraisals, as any development would clearly be prominent and visually intrusive. Lack of screening. Impact on visual amenity Further erosion of green belt and there are more suitable sites proposed elsewhere</p> <p>There are plenty of other brownfield sites in the area that could be used Natural screening will take years to grow; other screening would be unsightly/unacceptable</p> <p>Oaklands Farm lies below the level of Birmingham Road, and its conspicuousness is exacerbated by the lack of thick bushes or hedgerows around the area. The site would undoubtedly attract drivers' attention and could lead to accidents</p> <p>Adverse impact an important feature of the natural and historic environment and tourist attraction of canal/locks. Tow path is popular walk for local residents. Impact on walkers near the canal and boat users Historic importance of locks/canal</p> <p>Impact on wildlife site not mentioned in appraisal</p>	<p>The Council would prefer not to utilise Green Belt land, however, in the absence of other available land, consideration has to be given to previously developed Green Belt sites especially where the land owner is willing to discuss the possibility of selling land for such a use.</p> <p>Landscaping/screening would be taken into account at the time of a planning application but there is already a belt of trees/vegetation that screens much of the site from the road frontages</p> <p>No additional sites have been suggested through the consultation process</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that the site would have a negative impact on any of these features if designed properly including landscaping</p> <p>This aspect has been taken into account having obtained ecological advice on potential sites from WCC</p>
-------------	--	--	---

		<p>Impact on local businesses</p> <p>Present use by Caravan and Camping Club is small scale with no comparison between caravan parked for a short space of time to that of permanent pitches with the possibility of wooden structures not to mention noise and activity Would result in the loss of an existing caravan/camping site, which would not help the local economy</p> <p>Although on main road it is still peaceful and country location Birmingham Road is stretch of beautiful countryside, with occasional housing visible and local public houses</p> <p>A4700 is busy road. Further activity with accessing/leaving proposed site would increase difficulties; road has had serious accidents, including a fatality Congestion at peak times; road issues not mentioned in assessment Road junction with Ugly Bridge Road is notorious accident black spot which will get worse. Impact on congestion A lot of traffic now uses short cuts through smaller roads and Ugly Bridge, which causes problems, delays and damage to the road Dangerous crossing as a family and trying to get our own children across. Cars come so fast and it is no place for pedestrians Would bring about increased use of narrow Woodway</p> <p>Poor air quality for residents</p> <p>Road frequently floods. Part of site in Flood Zone 3</p> <p>Site between main road, water, bridges</p>	<p>It isn't clear what effect is envisaged. Many businesses could benefit from an increase in the number of potential customers</p> <p>The Caravan and Camping Club use means that caravans come and go in the short term. Permanent pitches would ensure that there is a presence on the site which would give additional certainty to the longer term use of the site and would reduce the number of movements of larger and slower moving vehicles</p> <p>Other consultation responses would suggest not</p> <p>WCC highways officers have suggested access arrangements which are acceptable to them</p> <p>The evidence is that it is no worse than any other main road approaching the town</p> <p>An air quality assessment may be required as part of a planning application</p> <p>Development is not proposed to be within an area recorded as suffering from flooding</p> <p>Children live in a</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>not suitable for unsupervised children/pets Nearby railway embankment is a potential danger for children living on the site Too close to farm and garage to be a safe environment</p> <p>Lack of school places and schools already extended/under pressure</p> <p>Infrastructure is insufficient to withstand the site plus the proposed 90 dwellings on the opposite side of the road Lack of medical facilities/under pressure</p> <p>Would require CPO as owner does not wish to sell Landowner unwilling to sell and this has been a negative on other sites. Existing business on the site will be at risk, which could mean compensation is payable No proof/indication that reducing site area would retain viability of remaining unit</p> <p>Locks and canal side amenity impaired</p> <p>Addition of potentially semi-industrial site would affect tourism</p> <p>Factors mentioned in the full site assessment are omitted from the policy document - this misrepresents the site characteristics</p>	<p>variety of environments and this includes living in boats on the water and in other dangerous locations. The supervision of children in such circumstances is not the responsibility of the Council</p> <p>The advice of the education authority (WCC) is that the numbers are likely to be relatively low and with new development and new schools through the Local Plan, there should be sufficient places available even if this means no longer taking children from 'out of area'</p> <p>New/improved infrastructure will be required to serve the new dwellings and will also serve this development</p> <p>On-going discussions with the owner do not support this view</p> <p>The viability of the remaining unit is under discussion with the land owner</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this would be the case</p> <p>Not all Travellers will wish to have business use on their site. This will be taken into account when a planning application is submitted, as will the individual site characteristics</p> <p>The full detail is contained in the site assessments but the consultation document summarises the most</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Aware that the Council recently rejected the proposed development of a similar site between the canal and Birmingham Road owned by Mr Arkwright, close by to the west along the Birmingham Road. How does the Council reconcile the refusal of this proposal with listing GT19, a similar nearby site, as a Preferred Site? Council recently rejected the proposed development of a similar site further west along the Birmingham Road. The Council's reasoning's were sound and should be reiterated on this site Planning applications for similar activities refused in past. Kites Nest site less than a mile away and a similar development was dismissed at appeal because of Green Belt location. For sake of consistency this site should not be allocated</p> <p>Would result in drastic dynamic change of the street. There are currently 14 dwellings and a further 5 dwellings would alter the current neighbourhood dynamics far too significantly Number of houses directly on Birmingham Road, and two housing terraces which would be overwhelmed/outnumbered by additional families</p> <p>No mention is made of possible flood risk from adjacent canal and fields which flood regularly; being adjacent to canal means this land has a high sensitivity to development</p> <p>Reference that the site as "previously developed land" is misleading; previous use was for agricultural purposes There is inconsistency between describing the site as Grade 3 agricultural land and previously developed land Council has been inconsistent in approach to site: calling it agricultural and previously developed land, rejecting site nearby for houses because of its proximity to the canal, rejecting previous applications for caravans on this site</p>	<p>important points for each site. The full site information is therefore in the background evidence as required and is accessible as part of the consultation to assist responses</p> <p>Unaware of a similar application for land owned by this gentleman</p> <p>Kites Nest Lane is a totally different site. It is undeveloped Green Belt land on a small country lane in a high quality landscape setting with serious flooding issues, even further from services and facilities and with no public transport</p> <p>With another 90 potential dwellings to be built in the Draft Local Plan on the opposite side of the road, five pitches would have very little additional impact</p> <p>The Environment Agency and drainage engineers advise that this land is in Flood Zone 1 and therefore would be an acceptable location for such a development</p> <p>The land is described as 'previously developed' as there is currently development upon it i.e. the residential use and a number of small business operations. All land outside the urban area has an agricultural land classification</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>regardless of its current use The site has been partially utilised by the Caravan and Camping Club for a number of years. Previous applications have been for the storage and sale of caravans, which is quite a different use and set of circumstances to residential caravan use</p> <p>Site already in state of disarray which will only get worse</p> <p>One local shop</p> <p>Bus service is infrequent and doesn't not run on Sunday</p> <p>Effect on wildlife - Debris from site could impact ecology of area Impact on land contamination/noise/disturbance Canal is classified as local wildlife site and south an Eco-site 30/26</p> <p>Current uses are beneficial to local economy</p> <p>Site is too small for business uses to be included</p> <p>Existing petrol station and roads would make living on the site dreadful</p>	<p>Proper development to a design, layout and landscape plan could improve the site</p> <p>This is a local facility which may benefit from additional customers which the site will bring</p> <p>There is a bus service and the site is not far from Warwick Parkway railway station, but the buses are not as regular as one some routes</p> <p>Advice on this aspect has been given by WCC but there is no reason to believe that this use would have any more impact than current uses</p> <p>It may be that these will continue even if this part of the site is developed</p> <p>Not all sites will require business use dependent upon the individual needs of the families involved. This will be considered, if requested, at the time of a planning application</p> <p>A noise assessment may be required as part of a planning application</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Could lead to a higher fear of crime. A greater police presence in the community would undoubtedly be necessary</p> <p>Too many cogent reasons against this site for it to be practically deliverable without leaving the Council open to legal action for damages in the future</p> <p>There are plenty of other brownfield sites in the area that could be used</p> <p>Combined effects of this and new housing need to be taken into consideration</p> <p>The consultation process is being carried out extremely rapidly and is entirely undemocratic. The short consultation process is completely unnecessary and throws into question whether residents are being allowed fair and proper consultation. The consultation process should be repeated, ensuring that Hatton Parish Council can carry out its full role in local government</p> <p>No consideration has been given to the cost involved in providing 5 pitches on a 0.25 acre site</p> <p>Site is only 0.25 hectares not 0.3 hectares, which means fewer pitches can</p>	<p>As a percentage of crime overall there is no reason to believe that a greater police presence would be necessary</p> <p>?</p> <p>The Council did ask for the details of any potential sites not yet considered, but nothing new has been suggested</p> <p>Whilst the two potential sites may have an effect, it also means that the two together could provide more/improved infrastructure that would benefit the whole of the community</p> <p>The Government sets down the length of time for public consultations and in this case, that would be six weeks. This Council often allows longer than this when time permits and has often agreed to extend the consultation period where agreed when certain conditions prevail e.g. a Parish Council does not have a meeting scheduled at a time that permits a response to be submitted within the consultation period</p> <p>The cost would fall to whoever develops the site but as the Council will not be providing pitches, there should be no cost to the public purse</p> <p>Agreed, but depending on pitch sizes required</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>be provided than anticipated Site is narrow and 0.3 acres</p> <p>Subjective to describe site as having 'urban feel' A rural, not urban feel to the site</p> <p>Safety issues around roaming dogs</p> <p>Site would be affected by light pollution</p> <p>Blight notices may be issued by property owners near the site unable to sell homes which Council will have to pay. Value of local property would definitely suffer</p> <p>Recent group of illegally encamped Travellers left mess after a week of residence opposite this site. Whole area would need management - no explanation of this</p> <p>On edge of Green Belt and although listed as developed land, understand this is incorrect</p>	<p>and access arrangements, it may still be possible to provide 5 pitches</p> <p>This south side of Birmingham Road has a row of houses, the proposed site with several business uses, a petrol service station and shop and a pub in close proximity which is more urban in context than rural. On the opposite side of the road, the recent Hatton Park development is a sizeable residential estate and new houses are proposed diagonally opposite to this GT19 site</p> <p>This should not be an issue any more than with dogs from the settled community</p> <p>Not an issue in this location and when properly screened but would be taken into account at the time of a planning application</p> <p>Our legal representatives will advise on this issue</p> <p>This is the sort of event that we wish to reduce by introducing properly run permanent (WDC) and transit (WCC) sites. There are more powers for the County Council and Police to utilise if there are sites provided</p> <p>The site is previously developed land by virtue of the fact that there is an existing residential unit and a number of businesses/buildings</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>Roads not gritted in winter</p> <p>Will reduce property prices at Hatton Park Estate and reduce investment in the area. Hatton Park residents would be outnumbered</p> <p>Increase in crime experienced when Travellers have been visiting</p> <p>Support: An ideal site and possibly small enough for the local community to absorb, although this should be carefully monitored Offers suitable conditions for a limited number of pitches, is partially developed for use of caravans, and therefore has access points and existing services Proximity of other buildings here and the non-agricultural nature of the land adjacent to the A4141 Birmingham Road make this a potentially acceptable location after GT04 and a site at Siskin Drive This is a good site but small so only suitable for 5 pitches Landowner is said to be willing to co-operate Given its location and surroundings it will have minimal Green Belt impact Caravans already on site hence lower costs of implementation, despite small site Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low - medium Field has long been in domestic use i.e. boarding kennel. There is a bus service to Warwick and Hatton hospital. There is no-one nearby to feel any visual impact Property close to the site is for sale so could provide further opportunity for pitches Already caters for travellers and better</p>	<p>on the land. The area of land outlined in the document is part of that planning unit and is utilised by Camping and Caravan Club members</p> <p>This is not an issue which we can take into account</p> <p>This is not a planning issue. There is no reason to suspect that this would be the case. The number of pitches/people involved is likely to be small compared with the number of Hatton Park residents</p> <p>This is on an illegal encampment and not the sort of site WDC will be expecting</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>than providing a new site which may not be used Well positioned to fit the criteria</p> <p>Comment: Unlikely to significantly affect any internationally designated sites or significantly harm nationally designated SSSIs Could be delivered in 5 years Good access to facilities/services May contribute to accidents due to petrol station and Ugly Bridge Road Opposite boggy ground and small lake</p>	
GTalt01	Brookside Willows, Banbury Road	<p>Objection: Proximity to Grade 1 Castle Park/Conservation Area Settings document prepared for sites at Gallows Hill and The Asps site on the impact of Banbury Road and adjacent agricultural land has highlighted the importance of these features to the settings of Warwick Castle Park, Warwick Conservation area and Warwick Castle Degree of harm to significance of affected heritage assets from Gypsy and Traveller site proposal has yet to be clearly determined. Assessing impact on heritage assets criteria - appropriate assessment not undertaken and site cannot therefore be allocated National significance of Park needs to be conserved and strongly encourage consideration of other potential sites General contours and original tree belt are still well defined along Banbury Road and part of the important route that forms part of the setting and sense of arrival to the heritage assets Rural setting to east with some screening but left 'thin' to allow views Where adverse impacts are unavoidable/justified, Plan should consider how harm might be reduced and any residual harm mitigated. Such initiatives need to be justified/evidenced Static caravans and mobile homes within these important views would be unacceptable development in this sensitive area Proximity to Warwick Technology Park and road would be too noisy for residents Banbury Road is one of most important routes into Warwick and provides historic views to castle and St Mary's church Importance had been recognised in most recent version of LP which preserved area to south and east of Banbury Road from development. Case made by English Heritage and others of importance of area to heritage. Irrational proposal therefore Access to amenities would require travel</p>	<p>The principle of a caravan park has already been established in this location since there is extant permission for a holiday caravan site. The historic value is appreciated but the site is well screened and a landscape scheme could improve this further by including tree planting where trees have been removed and to enhance further the current roadside screening. The land owners intend to fully implement the holiday caravan site use which will see 60+ caravans using the site and access</p>

		<p>by vehicle over Castle Bridge into Warwick causing further delays/congestion. Site would be first view of Warwick Site of one of largest heronries in the country</p> <p>The existing permission for caravans (non-gypsy) and the building of the access does not justify allowing this approach to be degraded by an unattractive and intrusive land use</p> <p>Has previously accepted contaminated material including Special Waste which has hazardous properties. Council previously indicated that the site would not be considered because of its previous use - irrational for the council to change its mind Understand that floating foundations has been mentioned to overcome contamination but this would be extremely costly and uneconomical for 10 sites Has received industrial/commercial waste and is not fit for human habitation Still vents methane</p> <p>Not clear that the permission for a touring caravan use (and thus the remediation conditions it imposed on the site) has been implemented</p> <p>Previous permission for touring caravan use does not imply that a permanent caravan use would be acceptable</p> <p>Access to site is fraught with difficulty Road busy and vehicles travel at high speed Banbury Road busy and already suffers traffic delays. Traffic speeds dangerous for children crossing/vehicles entering/leaving site</p>	<p>There is no reason to believe that the appearance of the site would be any less attractive than if holiday caravans were to be located here. In fact long term residents are likely to take more care of the site</p> <p>Contamination issues have been conditioned in the previous permission and Environmental Health officers have advised that there are methods of dealing with this The cost would fall to the developer. There are funding channels open for the provision of Gypsy and Travellers sites which could assist in the set-up costs. The Council however would not consider spending on this provision. Any Travellers wishing to set up a site would do so at their own cost</p> <p>The permission has been partly implemented in that some ground-works have taken place and the new access has been constructed. This will keep the remainder of the permission alive to be implemented at any time</p> <p>There is a new access lane constructed as part of the implementation of planning permission as described above. This was designed to</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Local schools full with no places for children to be schooled locally. If traveller children take precedence this will cause resentment, especially if places not taken on full time basis</p> <p>'A' class road would have negative impact on residents health Concerned about the safety of the actual site and the suitability of its location</p> <p>Landowners' intentions are unknown which questions the site's deliverability Landowner is not willing to cooperate Site is near completion for 65 holiday caravan pitches</p> <p>Villagers and the traveller community will not be able to integrate and as such the breakdown of the current harmonious community will be lost Cannot integrate despite edge of urban area location</p> <p>Loss of valuable amenity for the tourist trade may render it impractical and unviable Costs/mitigation/compensation would be high</p> <p>Something of an eyesore with various items of debris. The site should be cleaned up as it is on the approach to Warwick.</p> <p>Development would jeopardise future restoration of Castle Park</p>	<p>reduce the risk at the access to the site</p> <p>The advice of the education authority (WCC) is that the numbers are likely to be relatively low and with new development and new schools through the Local Plan, there should be sufficient places available even if this means no longer taking children from 'out of area'</p> <p>An assessment would need to be made as part of a planning application</p> <p>On-going discussions with landowners</p> <p>The site is close to Warwick and to Bishops Tachbrook with opportunities for integration with either/both communities</p> <p>There are funding channels open for the provision of Gypsy and Travellers sites which would assist in the set-up costs. The Council however would not consider spending any money on this provision</p> <p>This could be achieved if the site was developed</p> <p>The site is not within the ownership of the Castle Park owner and has planning permission for use as a caravan park which has been partly implemented. This too will jeopardise future restoration</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Will totally blight emerging and valuable tourist business which will accommodate 65 holiday caravans</p> <p>Remote from services/facilities in spite of pedestrian access</p> <p>Support-: Not in Green Belt/is previously developed land Is screened from Banbury Road preventing visual impact Additional tree planting can be put in place Has a good and safe access already built on to the main road which is important for movement of towed caravans Close to the local amenities Safe pedestrian access/footpath to town Choice of schools, surgeries and transport readily available Pleasant environment and no issues with noise (either way). Larger area than Barford sites and potentially could hold more pitches, making it more sense economically Will have less impact overall with services/drainage/infrastructure in place Has planning permission for similar use None of sites are ideal, but realise there will have to be some facility provided for gypsies and travellers by WDC Earmarked as a camping site but unlikely to be viable as a business. Obvious place that gives residents access to the plentiful services on offer in Warwick Town With minimal additional extra expenditure pedestrian access could also be easily provided Reduces cost to taxpayer with so much infrastructure already provided Would impact only a minimal number of existing land owners and residences in the vicinity Not using this site would be a waste of council tax No destruction of quality agricultural land at this site Flooded watercourses drain onto the road rather than the site As developed site it will have little impact on the ecology Safeguards are in place through the planning permission to deal with the landfill issue No immediate neighbours Well contained site Could be delivered more quickly Should not impact on the value of</p>	<p>Discussions are being held with the current landowner with regard to the business use</p> <p>The site is within an acceptable distance of all the facilities and services offered in Warwick</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>surrounding area Meets half the number of pitches required Less traffic on this main road compared to others in the area Previously developed land and does not waste good quality arable agricultural land Is of sufficient size to be expanded to 15 pitches if more needed Least intrusive and most cost effective and anyone should be pleased to reside there Would blend into surroundings Would not suffer from road noise/disruption On local transport routes</p> <p>Comment: Potential to indirectly affect neighbouring local wildlife sites (including potential sites) and should be avoided. If, through SA, you determine that these sites are in most sustainable locations and remain allocated, mitigation measures which preserve/enhance their wildlife interest should be identified Good choice of site providing contaminates can be controlled and any ground movements dealt with. Need to avoid damage to drains and pollutants getting into the watercourses Should progress to ascertain owners position and whether issues raised can be mitigated and addressed</p>	
<p>GTalt12</p>	<p>Land at Barford By-Pass</p>	<p>Objection Fails all the criteria set out by WDC for a suitable site Poor site on inside of 60mph road. Access would require major works and still be dangerous Access unsafe adjacent to A429, a very busy road with fast traffic; 60 mph limit. Pedestrians and schoolchildren would have to cross this road Proximity to junction for Barford village and road to Leamington which is difficult/busy Noise from road No safe access to school/public transport. To access both would require crossing busy/dangerous Barford Bypass which has poor accident record. Adding more traffic, particularly large slow moving vehicles, would exacerbate situation</p> <p>Noise reduction measures would reduce the available area to less than 5 pitches making the site unviable and mitigation would be ineffective but expensive</p> <p>CPO needed and likely failure would</p>	<p>These issues have also been raised and responded to under GT12 above</p>

		<p>render site undeliverable</p> <p>Loss of Grade 2 land will render agricultural holding unviable Prime agricultural land producing good grazing</p> <p>Long narrow site with difficult access for vans and trailers</p> <p>A429 Barford Bypass isolates the site from the village and therefore presents a physical barrier to integration</p> <p>Few local services available in Barford No GP/dentist/service station/secondary school/shops except community store</p> <p>Adverse impact on village school capacity</p> <p>Significant flood risk</p> <p>On visitor route from Warwick to Cotswolds – effect on tourism</p> <p>Integration into landscape difficult</p> <p>No GP in Barford No mains utilities Provision of utilities would not be cost effective</p> <p>Places undue pressure on local infrastructure/services and does not promote peaceful/integrated co-existence between site and local community</p> <p>Unsuitable, undeliverable and could not be developed</p> <p>Has WDC considered building design/layout and effect on open countryside</p> <p>Intrusive building in open Shakespearean Countryside on edge of Historic Village You say sites are akin to conventional housing. Planning application for housing on these sites would not be granted Views from A429 important and understood that modern planning considerations prevented developments sprawling beyond recognised boundaries. Local plan uses A429 as boundary to justify "in filling" between village and bypass. Proposals for two sites would be an extension to that</p> <p>Cannot integrate by imposition. A429 Barford Bypass isolates the site from the village and therefore presents a physical barrier to integration with the village</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>Site would not be allocated for any other development, including residential by the landowner</p> <p>Proximity to River with steep and high bank and related safety issues</p> <p>Added insult that a huge amount of community thought care and work has gone in to this site to make it available to the community</p> <p>Green field a satellite from Barford village, so will have a material adverse effect on the landscape and could not be integrated without harming the visual amenity and character of the site</p> <p>Socio-economic and environmental impacts</p> <p>Residents have reported the existence of water voles in and immediately adjacent to the site</p> <p>WDC have disregarded their own Rural Area Policies, especially RAPs 1 (New Housing), 6 (New Employment), 10 (Safeguarding Rural Roads) and 15 (Camping and caravan Sites)</p> <p>Costs/mitigation/compensation would be very high</p> <p>No public rights of way over most of length of Westham Lane. Rights may need to be acquired from some 6 different parties who have private rights of way</p> <p>No evidence of viability</p> <p>Unlikely the private sector will fund the scheme</p> <p>Threat of CPO does not make site available/deliverable now</p> <p>Effect on local businesses, tourism and two farms</p> <p>Eight pitches could dominate nearest settled community which is the Westham hamlet and change its character</p> <p>Is Council proposing a mixed use site including business uses?</p>	<p>The extent of the site originally envisaged inclusion of the land owned by WCC, however this was excluded because it had been leased to the village as a riverside walk/amenity space and work had been undertaken in this regard</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Not necessarily. This depends on what is required by the family</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>No reference to River Avon designated LWS and that otters have been recorded along this stretch of river</p> <p>Not yet tackled archaeology and location within minerals safeguarding area</p> <p>Tethering of animals would reduce space for van on sites</p> <p>Support:</p> <p>Comment: Unlikely to significantly affect any internationally designated sites or significantly harm nationally designated SSSIs Support, but is likely to put pressure on services in Barford</p>	<p>utilising the site and the views of the relevant authorities</p> <p>This is within the site appraisals</p> <p>See under 'Comment' below for the view of the ecology officer</p> <p>Not all Gypsies and Travellers have animals but this would be taken into account at the time of a planning application</p>
Amber Sites			
GT06	Land at Park Farm/Spinney Farm	<p>Objection: Would harm rural buffer zone and destroy visual amenity on the approach to Warwick Visual impact on entrance to historic Warwick Visual impact on countryside Impact on rural landscape and approach to Warwick Castle tourist attraction Considerable screening will be required to lessen any impact, this will be costly & take years to mature</p> <p>Severely restricts access for the owner of Park Farm to his remaining land Adverse effect on viability of the farm business</p> <p>Proximity to major roads A452 and A425 with accompanying road noise pollution and access issues Visual and ecological impact would also be made worse by the creation of a new access Access is onto busy road No safe access to school/public transport Adding more traffic, particularly large slow moving vehicles, would exacerbate</p>	<p>Careful landscaping would be needed to ensure that the visual impact of the site would be minimal and could provide cover at an early stage. This would be achieved through conditions on a planning decision notice</p> <p>The exact location of the pitches would have to take this into account. The access would also have a bearing on site layout. These details would be considered at the time of a planning application</p> <p>A noise assessment would be required to ensure that pitches were located to minimise noise WCC highways officers have suggested access arrangements which are acceptable to them</p>

		<p>existing problems</p> <p>Already been used for construction company for road alterations</p> <p>Cost of compulsory purchase</p> <p>Which school would children attend? Would it cope alongside new housing development No bus route No access to facilities No GP in Barford</p> <p>Is this site set for facilities needed by Gypsies and Travellers No mains utilities. Places undue pressure on local infrastructure/services and does not promote peaceful/integrated co-existence between site and local community</p> <p>Close to other proposed site GTalt01</p> <p>Unsuitable, undeliverable and could not be developed</p> <p>Villagers and the traveller community will not be able to integrate and as such the breakdown of the current harmonious community will be lost Remote from the community</p> <p>Potential contamination of watercourse and River Avon</p> <p>Support: Good alternative. Better than close to village This site (and Brookside) would have less impact on village and amenities Easy access to Leamington Road access onto A425 Access to schools in Warwick/Leamington Second preference but worried about</p>	<p>Not aware of this</p> <p>Currently unknown as this is not the course of action which the Council wishes to take, but will need to consider should the number of required pitches not be met on sites where there is a willing landowner</p> <p>WCC as the education authority would allocate school places The new housing developments in the district provide an opportunity for new schools and other facilities</p> <p>Services would need to be provided on site, but this applies to virtually all sites</p> <p>It would not be the intention to place sites close together, therefore, if sufficient pitches could be provided elsewhere then the need for two sites close together would not arise</p> <p>This is less to do with location and more to do with community acceptance</p> <p>See under 'comment' below for the view of the ecology officer</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>access onto busy road Difficult to understand site is designated amber - it is flat and could be easily accessed from the M40 slip road - so if Gtalt01 fails, then this site should be the next in line for this parish None of the reasons given are strong enough to preclude the site as being Green. Utilising 6 pitches here would spread the burden of provision around the district Former landfill use will reduce the developable area, making the site less viable Compulsory purchase will increase the costs No appropriate solution found in reference to sewerage disposal. A mains connected sewer is preferable, but it is stated in the consultation document that this is "unlikely Socio-economic and environmental impacts This proposal is close to GT01 and GT15. Could the sites be more spread around Warwickshire Site is not for sale and any CPO will be resisted. The site is adjacent to the farmhouse and therefore particularly important during the lambing season Costs/mitigation/compensation would be medium No indication of the relative weight to be placed on each criteria Not rational to identify a site as Preferred or Alternative if CPO powers are required Adverse effect on the amenity of the residents at the farm Continued unresolved status of this site will cause concern to both the landowner and local community Absence of Highway safety information regarding access and the implications for Highways Safety and traffic flow on the creation of a new access and the type and volume of traffic likely to frequent this site Not enough information to support the contention that this site is viable, deliverable or 'sound' Large gaps in knowledge and information leaving the issues that WDC, local residents and this report have identified unresolved Need assessment of heritage assets and impact on setting of Castle Park</p> <p>Comment: Unlikely to significantly affect any internationally designated sites or significantly harm nationally designated SSSIs Site has not been 'industrialised' and</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>would make for an easy conversion Any application would require a Preliminary Risk Assessment to assess the possible impact of contamination on water receptors. Regardless of the floodplain extent, the watercourse and ponds must be protected and buffered from any development. Site unlikely to connect to foul mains sewer. Nearest water body for discharge is therefore Tach Brook but it is failing in its objectives due to high phosphate levels. The site is therefore not desirable due to its impact on the water environment. Suitable means of dealing with foul effluent required</p>	
Gt08	<p>Depot west of Cubbington Heath Farm</p>	<p>Objection: Implications for work of charity which owns site The charitable trust which owns the site will not sell and jeopardise its long term interests</p> <p>Unclear what access to education, health and welfare would be available Not sustainable in terms of access to public transport and health facilities</p> <p>Highway safety issues that may result from accessing and egressing this site on to the A445</p> <p>Would potentially create noise and disturbance to the nearby residents</p> <p>Could have a detrimental impact on wildlife</p> <p>Previous use could have contaminated the site making it expensive to develop Extensive remedial work required</p> <p>Only worth considering if HS2 is built on the line proposed, as it would then be degraded and could be acceptable as a gypsy site</p>	<p>The Council would not wish to jeopardise the work of the charity, but the sale or rent of the land could also raise funds</p> <p>The site is on the edge of Leamington and also close to Cubbington, either of which could provide the services/facilities required</p> <p>WCC as highways authority has advised that the visibility splays required should be achievable</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this would be the case. The site is 150m from the closest dwellings but there are very few in this location. HS2 is more likely to be an issue</p> <p>See under 'comment' below for the views of the ecology officer</p> <p>Further investigation of possible contaminants would be necessary if this site were to be carried forward</p> <p>Any degraded site not suitable for traditional houses would not be considered suitable for</p>

		<p>Site was historically used as a tip but not known what was deposited so any development would involve expensive investigation and decontamination. The site formed part of a large site that had been mined and quarried for stone in the past. It would therefore have to be safeguarded from any form of residential use.</p> <p>Site was historically used as a tip but not known what was deposited so any development would involve expensive investigation and decontamination.</p> <p>Cubbington has enough problems with the proposed HS2 line Ancient woodland already under threat from HS2 proposals</p> <p>Surely better to use a site that doesn't already have a useful purpose</p> <p>Tantamount to a land grab and is immoral</p> <p>Unclear why gypsies and travellers need such a site</p>	<p>Gypsy and Traveller sites, particularly where noise may be an issue since caravans are more noise vulnerable than bricks and mortar</p> <p>Any historically tipped area would be examined carefully before being developed</p> <p>This is a significant concern for a large part of the district and is a scheme which the Council continues to raise objection to</p> <p>The site is currently used for the storage of road salt. This could however easily be stored at another of the WCC depots</p> <p>Presumably this refers to the use of compulsory purchase which is discussed elsewhere in this report</p> <p>Warwick District Council fails in its responsibility to provide any such accommodation. Permanent sites are required for those Travellers wishing to settle in one place which they can use as a base from which to travel, but also allows them access to schools, doctors and other health care provision, particularly for children and the elderly. The Council appointed the University of Salford to produce an independent piece of work (Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment) which quantifies the need for</p>
--	--	---	--

		<p>Classified under the Mines and Quarries Act 1954 and is therefore safeguarded from residential uses</p> <p>Support: Close to Town (Leamington and Warwick) for services Well-connected access and road network Self-contained minimum impact on others Already Council site and could be implemented quickly Should challenge Green Belt paradigm and progress Former use will have no real impact on the proposal Impact on wildlife will be no greater than any other site Close to HS2 but so are thousands of houses Ground water risks are manageable Access onto a modest volume, modest speed road is possible Gypsy and travellers may well prefer this sort of location as it is more remote than other sites. WCC owned and so available Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low once vacated Good site though small and should be further assessed Previously developed and unsuitable for agricultural use In easy reach of amenities Not as remote as the assessment suggests – closer than some of the preferred options No insurmountable issues</p> <p>Comment: Unlikely to significantly affect any internationally designated sites or significantly harm nationally designated SSSIs Good access to road Close to edge of urban area and services/facilities but would share with salt store. Close to settled community to allow for social integration Need to remove some hedgerow to provide sight-lines No nearby watercourse for treated effluent disposal. Not large enough for septic tank. Potential leaching from side of elevated site. Reducing ground level will cause disturbance of potential contaminants</p>	<p>both permanent and Transit sites</p> <p>Advice is being sought on this from WCC minerals officer</p>
GT11	Land at Budbrooke	<p>Objection: Close to racecourse (a tourist attraction) and also St Marys Land (of historic</p>	The location, on the edge of Warwick has

	<p>Lodge, Racecourse and Hampton Road</p>	<p>importance) and Green Belt. Assets would be adversely affected</p> <p>Wildlife and racehorses (close to the stables) may come into contact with non – vaccinated animals which could cause them harm/ expose them to the risk of disease</p> <p>The site includes the Gog Brook Local Wildlife Site and Budbrooke Lodge, which is a private residence and the development is likely to have an adverse impact on important features of the natural surroundings</p> <p>In the flood plain - a site here would exacerbate flooding problems Site area has been reduced to avoid flood plain; caravans and mobile homes are more vulnerable to flooding than traditional houses. Also flood mitigation measures for traditional housing, are unlikely to be financially viable</p> <p>Could not be successfully integrated into the existing community causing discord and resentment</p> <p>The Budbrooke Lodge access on to the site is preferred by the highway authority and this may not be available, so if a CPO is required; the expenditure on this and a CPO would not be an appropriate use of limited financial resources of WDC</p> <p>Problems of safety with regard to access and the road network at this location particularly as it is close to Chase Meadow/ Purser Drive and Hampton Road (where there are already issues with excessive speed) Movement of caravans and large vehicles in and out of the site on such a fast and busy road would not only be potentially dangerous to the proposed occupiers it could increase the likelihood of more accidents to other traffic Would locate the pitches between the A46 dual carriageway plus the fast and busy Henley Road at this section of the proposed site on the bridge acting as a blind dip/approach at the site access position</p> <p>Noise and disturbance to other development locally and would itself be</p>	<p>distinct advantages in terms of access to services and facilities</p> <p>Noted. Steps would need to taken at the time of a planning application to restrict the movement of animals on and around the racecourse</p> <p>See under 'comments' for the views of the ecology officer</p> <p>See under 'comments' for the views of the Environment Agency</p> <p>This is less to do with location and more to do with community acceptance</p> <p>WCC as highway authority accepts that an existing access west of the access to Budbrooke Lodge, would be acceptable CPO will only be used as a last resort</p> <p>WCC as highway authority accepts that an existing access west of the access to Budbrooke Lodge, would be acceptable and is happy with access and egress to the road system</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that excessive</p>
--	---	---	---

		<p>subject to noise from nearby A46 Potential impact on health in view of proximity to road – effects of long term exposure to traffic noise. Caravans more noise vulnerable Impact of land contamination, noise and other disturbance</p> <p>Would put further pressure on local schools that are struggling to cope with current demand for pupil places</p> <p>Will cause negative equity issues with surrounding properties and reduce the ability of people to sell/move</p> <p>Racecourse and adjacent St Mary's land/golf course is a major attraction but seems always to be under pressure from planning applications. Hope WDC will continue to resist any new permanent buildings or a permanent gypsy/travellers site. Of course a temporary site is needed for such as the Billy Smarts Circus</p> <p>British Horseracing Authority (horseracing's governing body) confirmed that they would be unlikely to grant Warwick Racecourse a license to continue to race by virtue of the proximity of the Traveller site and the associated risks. Such risks could have very serious repercussions for the industry and therefore they do not wish to put the industry or the Racecourses in that position. If that occurs, the Racecourse business (a part of Warwick's history over the last three centuries) would immediately cease.</p> <p>There would be significant impacts on local employment, entertainment, retail, tourism</p> <p>The ownership of the land was not stated</p> <p>Development of South West Warwick stops at the Henley Road. Urban development should not be allowed to cross it</p> <p>Submission Draft Warwick District Local Plan notes that, camping and caravan</p>	<p>noise and or contamination would be a problem, but a noise assessment would need to be carried out with regard to the potential impact from the A46</p> <p>Newburgh PS has been extended and Aylesford School intends to build an infant/junior school on site. In addition three new schools are proposed as part of the new developments to the south of Warwick, Leamington and Whitnash</p> <p>Open non green belt land within easy reach of the facilities of Warwick will always be under threat from development as it represents a sustainable locality</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>These could be utilised by the families moving to the site</p> <p>It is owned by the King Henry VIII Trust</p> <p>Open land within easy reach of the facilities of Warwick will always be under threat from development as it represents a sustainable locality</p> <p>This policy does not relate to Gypsy and</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>sites can seriously harm the landscape if they are insensitively located and although Gypsy and Traveller sites are not 'caravan sites', the physical characterises are clearly very similar and therefore the nature and quality of the development proposed could be harmful to the landscape in this location</p> <p>Visible from public areas, including the golf course, public rights of way around the racecourse and the racecourse itself. It is likely that it would be visible when races are televised. The suitability of development of this nature in such a sensitive location where visual impact is particularly important must be questioned Gypsy and traveller site will not achieve an appropriate standard of design and is incompatible with the racecourse as an adjacent land use</p> <p>Principally in the ownership of King Henry VIII Endowed Trust, compulsory purchase powers would be required with significant financial and time considerations for the Council. The site is not available or deliverable without compulsory purchase Budbrooke Lodge is in the ownership of the King Henry VIII Endowed Trust and it is not available, there clearly remain concerns over the suitability of the site based on access considerations</p> <p>Amenity of residents at Budbrooke Farm or those in the wider area has not been appropriately considered</p> <p>Support: None of the reasons given are strong enough to preclude the site as being marked Green. This site would give access to the plentiful services in Warwick and has access to facilities and transport links Site flooding overstated, this is a large site well away from the A46 so noise shouldn't be an issue. There are many houses closer to the A46 Impact on racecourse minimal All aspects are very positive Costs/mitigation/compensation would be medium – low Good/available site which should be used to maximum capacity Close to all services and with good road</p>	<p>Traveller sites as these will be permanent pitches and have a different appearance to other camping and caravan sites. A high quality of development is expected for these sites</p> <p>A good landscaping scheme will be required, but there is always potential for views into and out of the site</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>The consultation has given anyone interested the opportunity to raise any issues they may have or promote views on any of the potential sites</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>access Good site well located on less busy road with good nearby services and pedestrian access Would be low cost to develop</p> <p>Comment: Unlikely to significantly affect any internationally designated sites or significantly harm nationally designated SSSIs Suitable with little additional work Recent works have improved flooding situation Close to amenities, services, bus stops Not in the Green Belt Newburgh PS has been extended and Aylesford School intends to build an infant/junior school on site</p>	
GTalt02	Wood Yard, Rugby Road, Cubbington	<p>Objection: Use of this land would involve incorporating an area of North Cubbington Wood</p> <p>Adverse impact on important features of the natural and historic environment Would harm the woodland's restoration and make it less attractive for visitors</p> <p>Support: No strong reasons to preclude this site Would give access to services in Leamington Spa and has access to facilities and transport links In Green Belt but previously developed Previously developed and has suitable existing access Potentially ideal but may not be 'cheap' to achieve due to need to buy whole site – worth exploring</p> <p>Comment: Potential to indirectly affect neighbouring local wildlife sites (including potential sites) and should be avoided. If, through SA, you determine that these sites are in most sustainable locations and remain allocated, mitigation measures which preserve/enhance their wildlife interest should be identified could be a good site and should be followed up. Reasons for rejection are poor and would seem to hinge on Green Belt? Large site and not prone to flooding. No more remote from services than other preferred sites. Visibility splays can be provided. Would be possible to purchase the whole site, as requested by the owner. Costs/mitigation/compensation would be medium +</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p>

<p>GTalt03</p>	<p>Land at Henley Road/Hampton Road, Hampton on the Hill</p>	<p>Objection: Green Belt/Previously Undeveloped Site NPPF requires exceptional reasons for development. Green Belt should only be considered at all in policy terms if no other viable options are available and this does not appear to be the case. Would 'harm' the Green Belt by reducing the degree of 'openness'. Would be prominent/ visually intrusive and the recommendation of an owner is not a relevant variable in the context of Green Belt policy. Council has noted GTalt03 as an open, green belt site and has not argued that there are is any exceptional case to allow development against the context of green belt policies Preference for sites to be provided and run by Gypsies and Travellers does not override Green Belt</p> <p>Not allocated for housing or within boundaries of village growth envelope for Hampton-on-the-Hill</p> <p>Site occupants would be exposed to high levels of noise and poor air quality due to proximity of A4189</p> <p>Fact that site is owned by Gypsy/Traveller does not detract from the legal assumption that the classification is 'inappropriate development'</p> <p>Sufficient 'green' sites to meet GTAA identified need</p> <p>Suggested that GTalt03 has capacity for 15 pitches and a recommended maximum of 15 pitches. Assuming that a 'family' consists of 3/4 individuals (traditionally gypsy/traveller families are larger than average households - there is much reported evidence of this fact), WDC proposes that between 45-60 individuals can be accommodated by a village of approximately 200 individuals. Such a change to local community, would be disproportionate</p> <p>Will substantially change character of area. Highly visible from both Henley Road and Hampton Road; characteristics of village will be changed. Screening would itself become intrusive Impact exacerbated by ground level being 1-2m higher than the Hampton Road</p> <p>Site does not lend itself to integration/inclusion of gypsy/traveller into community</p>	<p>The site is indeed Green Belt land, but there may be an exceptional case to make where there are no other willing land owners on other sites and CPO would result in slowing down the delivery of sites and adding risk to overall deliverability and costs to Council Tax payers</p> <p>This does not preclude its consideration</p> <p>Assessments will be carried out to determine this</p> <p>True, but a willing land owner is a factor to consider regardless of ethnicity</p> <p>This may not be the case</p> <p>It would not however preclude a site of this size where there are local facilities that can be accessed to serve the whole community</p> <p>Careful screening need not be intrusive and natural materials rather than walls and fences are to be preferred</p> <p>This is less to do with location and more to do with community</p>
----------------	--	--	---

		<p>Not within an area of expansion for the village so should be classed as a Red site</p> <p>Westerly aspect of site adjacent to local community allotments; village residents' values demonstrated by financial and emotional investment, permanence and commitment to preservation of rural community. Lifestyles are marked by quiet, sedentary, countryside pursuits. Introduction of the site will lead to an imbalance. Harmonious coexistence highly improbable and outcomes could have a significant impact on local authority resources. The human rights of the existing settled community has to take priority over transient population</p> <p>Assumption that additional funding for a school extension/expansion will be obtainable is not guaranteed</p> <p>Lack of services/facilities. GP not taking new patients Infrastructure of schooling, health and local road congestion further impaired</p> <p>Concerns for safety of children on site it is surrounded by busy roads. No play area close to site and Good Practice Guide positively discourages placement of sites close to electricity pylons High voltage (33kV) electricity cables crossing site with possible danger to residents children</p> <p>Highways Safety has been reason for refusing previous planning applications on site. Poses risk to occupants and other road users WDC has suggested access achievable along Hampton Road with required visibility splays. Not viable option given conditions</p> <p>Prominent to visitors entering/leaving Warwick with potential impact on tourism Is on a country lane</p>	<p>acceptance</p> <p>A final decision has not been made on village envelopes and Green Belt amendments as yet</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this would change significantly or to the detriment of the existing community</p> <p>This is less to do with location and more to do with community acceptance The rights of each community should be considered equally. The site would be permanent and not house a transient population, but one wanting to settle in an area and become part of that community Advice has been sought on these issues and WCC and the health authority these authorities have commented accordingly</p> <p>Advice has been obtained from National Grid and a suitable distance from the electricity pylons could be designed into the site layout to allow maintenance and build in safety</p> <p>WCC has advised the land owner of an acceptable access point. The previous refusal of planning permission was for a single pitch on a very small part of this site where highway issues were intensified</p> <p>A suitable landscaping scheme should lessen the impact from the</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Imposing position on entrance route to Warwick</p> <p>Site is on hill which already has issue with surface drainage. Hard standings will exacerbate flood/icing risk</p> <p>Recently been subject of application for use by Gypsy family and rejected the decision confirmed on appeal. Also an Injunction taken out to prevent any development. Still valid and relevant reasons for site not to be included</p> <p>Dangerous access generating more traffic movements than previous agricultural use.</p> <p>HCA do not accept applications for funding on Green Belt or environmentally sensitive sites</p> <p>Non Green Belt sites whether secured by CPO or not are preferable</p> <p>Pond on adjacent site is seasonal and unsuitable for the provision of water for fire fighting</p> <p>Budbrooke School is in Special Measures and all development has been halted</p> <p>Site access and egress for maintenance/fire service within 45 metres of a dwelling on site should be a consideration given the combustibility of the dwellings and LPG storage and usage Moving access towards brow of the hill is inappropriate and would make whole site</p>	<p>roadside</p> <p>The site would be designed to take this into account and may provide the opportunity to improve the situation overall</p> <p>The previous refusal of planning permission was for a single pitch on a very small part at the road junction where highway issues were intensified. This and the Green Belt issue were the reasons for refusal and the dismissal of the appeal. The injunction is to prevent development of the site until planning permission is obtained. The reasons for previous refusal could be overcome</p> <p>WCC has advised the land owner of an acceptable access point</p> <p>There are families wishing to fund sites themselves without the need to apply for grant funding</p> <p>Agreed, but with no land owners willing to consider selling land for this use, less suitable sites have to be considered</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Noted</p> <p>Advice of the emergency services will be obtained at the time of a planning application to ensure such aspects are taken into account</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>more conspicuous</p> <p>Possible land contamination if dumping of rubbish takes place</p> <p>Possible health issues for residents of site due to main road location</p> <p>It is understood a covenant is in place restricting the land for agricultural use</p> <p>Allocating this site would be a significant precedent</p> <p>Support: No strong reasons to preclude this site Would give access to services in Warwick and has access to facilities and transport links This is an ideal site. Why has it not been taken forward other than the Green Belt issue? All other aspects are very positive. Costs/mitigation/compensation would be medium - medium + Only constraint is that it is in the Green Belt. Removing the site from the Green Belt would not undermine any of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt. As such the site should be classed as suitable i.e. 'Green' and its removal from the Green Belt should be promoted Every effort should be made to address issues raised by local residents to ensure the proposal can succeed Land has been offered by owner who is keen to develop. Is on public transport route and close to GP surgery One of few willing landowners Close to settlement but not on top of them Services and facilities achievable Green Belt not sufficient reason to ignore site which would take 15 pitches Close to but separate from settled population Pedestrian crossing would solve access problems</p> <p>Comment: Unlikely to significantly affect any internationally designated sites or</p>	<p>There is no reason to think that this will occur since waste disposal facilities will be provided on site as for all Council Tax payers</p> <p>This would be assessed at the time of a planning application</p> <p>The Council is not aware of this, but if the site were to progress to the next stage this would be investigated further</p> <p>Noted</p>
--	--	---	--

		significantly harm nationally designated SSSIs Site is available and deliverable with willing land owner	
Other			
Policy PO1	Meeting the Requirement for Permanent Pitches	<p>A fundamental flaw in this draft policy is that there is no explanation of why some 'green' sites are in Preferred Sites and others are Alternative Sites</p> <p>Explain this shortlisting process, and provide copies of scoring sheets</p> <p>Inconsistency in the commentary for some sites being deemed suitable and others unsuitable e.g. the proximity of sites GTalt20 and GTalt23 to local wildlife sites are referenced but the proximity of GT19 to the Grand Union Canal Local Wildlife Site is not mentioned. This seriously undermines the soundness and confidence in deeming a site a "preferred" option</p> <p>The process to date seems to readily dismiss non-Green Belt sites because they are previously or currently allocated for other uses. Whilst these circumstances may bring practical implications / conflicting expectations they should not be ruled out so quickly as the exercise should not be limited only to currently unallocated sites it should be integral to planning the area as a whole</p> <p>To provide 31 pitches consider best arrangement to be</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. GT04 Harbury Lane land north of the Football club 6 pitches 2. GT12 Land south of Westham Lane, Barford 0 pitches GT12 land north of Westham Lane within new housing, as single pitches 3 pitches 3. GT19 Birmingham Road, Budbrooke 3 pitches 4. GTalt01 Brookside Willows, Banbury Road 6 pitches 5. GT08 Land north of Depot near 	<p>There are some sites which are green but more sustainable than others so slightly more preferable. These are the Preferred Options as they would also meet the required need of 25 pitches in the first five years, giving a five year land supply. Other green sites could be considered if those were to prove unavailable or undeliverable for some reason. If these were similarly to fail, then the amber sites could be looked at for an alternative, but one which may require some additional work or overcoming an obstacle to deliver</p> <p>Where sites are allocated for another purpose, such as for employment where land has been difficult to identify, the allocated use is considered to be the best use of the site. Most of these sites are however, in the middle of urban areas where neither the Travellers nor the settled community would feel happy</p> <p>Sites at Riverside House and the former Soan's site are in highly urban areas and neither the Travellers nor the settled community would feel happy</p>

		<p>Cubbington Heath Farm 7 pitches 6. Riverside House affordable homes, in single pitches 3 pitches 7. Soan's Sydenham affordable homes , in single pitches 3 pitches</p> <p>Inconsistency in the commentary for some sites being deemed suitable and others unsuitable For example: The Detailed Gypsy and Traveller Site Assessments note that GT19 "is adjacent to the Grand Union Canal Local Wildlife Site." But is omitted from Section 7 and the site remains a preferred option. But the proximity to a local wildlife site has been included within the commentaries in Section 7 for other sites</p> <p>Inconsistency in the commentary for some sites being deemed suitable and others unsuitable. For example: site GT19 being used by Caravan and Camping Club is presented as a positive factor but for GTalt22 it is noted that "As a Caravan and Camping Club site, this use would not be suitable".</p>	<p>The full site assessments can be viewed on the Council's website and by referring to the Sustainability Assessment. Local Wildlife sites are noted wherever the Council has been notified about them by the ecology team at WCC or through the EA. This is however one element and other issues also influence choices so cannot be taken in isolation</p> <p>The Camping and Caravan use at GT19 would cease once the Gypsy and Traveller site were set up. The Camping and Caravan Club at Warwick Racecourse however, would continue and these two uses do not mix therefore making that a negative factor</p>
Policy PO2		Higher level of engagement with landowners and farmers needed	Noted
Policy PO3		Too much attention paid to Green Belt paradigm given that Gypsy and Traveller need is seen to be exceptional enough to trigger positive discrimination in planning it should be exceptional enough to more imaginatively explore options within the Green Belt	The Government has made the Gypsy and Traveller accommodation issue a special case, but insists that Green Belt should not be utilised unless there are exceptional circumstances and a lack of sites does not represent such circumstances
Preferred Options for sites		Consultation document does not currently include sufficient information regarding process for site selection - would expect to see more information regarding sites suitability/facilities. There is little information relating to how sites may affect local infrastructure and nearest settled communities and businesses	The full site assessments can be viewed on the Council's website and by referring to the Sustainability Assessment. It is impossible to be certain of the effects of either community

		<p>Farming community must be fully consulted on all sites and given greater access to information on site selection process. Farmers are running businesses and have long term plans for investment/expansion, which may be affected by local sites. Critical that site selection process takes into account practical aspects of running farm business avoiding close proximity to livestock units, blocking rural roads and taking high quality agricultural land out of production</p> <p>NPPF requires "exceptional" circumstances to alter Green Belt boundaries, not "special" Council has failed to demonstrate any "exceptional" circumstances and should simply not be promoting any Green Belt site above any non-Green Belt site How can we control numbers and that the occupants are genuine gypsies/travellers?</p> <p>Strongly object to the proposal of destroying agricultural, nature rich land in and around Bishops Tachbrook for the purpose of creating hard standing traveller sites which if not controlled could become "eyesores". Residents close to these proposed sites have paid a premium to live in a village and for the view, will they be recompensed as they have rights too</p>	<p>upon the another until that has been experienced Agree. It is fully recognised that agriculture is as much a business as retail, offices or service provision. Unfortunately, many of the sites, due to the need for them to be on the edge of settlements, will be on, close to or have an effect on the farming community as well as other communities in the district and the sites are envisaged to be predominantly on what is currently farmland. The farming community have however, had equal opportunity with others to respond to the consultations on this matter</p> <p>The Council has to consider Green Belt possibilities particularly in view of the lack of land available outside the Green Belt. The planning system already has provision within it for establishing genuine Gypsies/Travellers and conditions on planning approvals will control the number of pitches on a given site. This together with site licensing. No-one is entitled to a view and situations change so an open view of the countryside can change when new development takes place. Residents in villages or elsewhere cannot prevent the growth which the Government has at the head of its agenda</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Sites assessed on mixed and matched criteria to achieve their own political agenda; one site is ruled out due to high pressure gas mains, the next a site is altered to accommodate the fact that there is a high pressure gas main</p> <p>In principle understand the need to have temporary and sensibly located sites for gypsies and travellers. However could not find any information on how these sites will be serviced (e.g. access, toilets etc.) nor how they will be policed to ensure that the sites should only be used on a temporary basis</p> <p>Serious reservations about so called permanent sites given the experience of such sites elsewhere in the south of England</p> <p>Experience from parts of South East shows control will be difficult given pressures on local services due to the rapid growth in the UK population and the no of homeless people looking to move out of the overcrowded south east</p> <p>Apart from pressure on local services a rise in local crime may be one result of overcrowding</p> <p>Whole process engineered to push the sites to boundaries of the District, thereby eliminating impact on Council's</p>	<p>Where there is space on a site or area of search to accommodate pitches without building within the specified safety zones surrounding the high pressure gas mains, then the site has been considered suitable for consultation purposes. If the site cannot accommodate pitches once that safety area has been removed, then the site is clearly not suitable and cannot progress to the next stage</p> <p>The sites are not meant to be temporary either in their existence or the length of stay of the occupants. The sites are to be permanent with families living on them who will stay as long as they wish since they will own or be renting their pitch and paying their Council Tax and service bills as they would if they lived in a traditional house. Details about the services to such sites will be determined through planning applications</p> <p>Can understand that there may be some reluctance by anyone who has had a poor experience, but not all people are the same and we would hope to encourage pride in place by families owning their own sites/pitches</p> <p>There is no evidence to support this view</p> <p>The sites have been largely located within land which is not</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>residents, and pushing costs for providing services and other welfare onto neighbouring districts. Site residents will not use Doctors/schools based on arbitrary district boundaries</p> <p>The GTAA ignores the impact of the planned Transit site near Southam which has been agreed since completion of the GTAA</p> <p>Little (and passive) publicity of the Consultation process and key milestones. it feels and looks like this is a deliberate underhanded approach</p> <p>Process has not complied with government guidance as insufficient consultation has been undertaken with neighbouring authorities, especially given green belt constraints of Warwick</p> <p>Community groups prior to the decision on the sites were not consulted. This runs contra to the government's guidelines which seek to avoid sites dominating the nearest settled community</p>	<p>designated Green Belt and this is to the south of the district. Additionally, they have been located within a reasonable distance of the major road network which is needed to access when they do travel and where facilities are accessible</p> <p>That's because it was 'since completion' of the GTAA so couldn't have been included. WDC has included it however when considering its transit need, although WCC advice is now that this site cannot be relied upon to meet the needs of WDC</p> <p>The Council has tried a wide range of methods for reaching people to get their views. There is always criticism however that people have not heard about the consultation. Every consultation still attracts a good number of responses bearing in mind not everyone is interested. The Council has an adopted Statement of Community Involvement which outlines the stages for consultation and the Council's commitment to the methods to be employed. This document can be found on the Council's website. The Council has listed those consultees who are always consulted. This includes all adjoining local authorities, WCC and all adjoining parish councils. Anyone can take part in the consultation, including community</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>Surgery and school in Harbury were not consulted to identify capacity levels. Understand that money for extending any current facilities is either not available or extremely limited. Again, contrary to government advice</p> <p>No due diligence on the Salford University GTAA report. Council's own 2011 report identified the need for just 15 transit pitches and that "demand for permanent site-based accommodation was low and transitory in nature"</p> <p>Why are all sites in south of Warwickshire? Proposed sites too close together</p>	<p>groups. The consultation period is the time when all views can be put forward whether for or against and new ideas/sites promoted. Consultations are also a good method of information gathering and collecting local information in particular which helps to inform the next stage of the process</p> <p>The information about schools and capacity is obtained from Warwickshire County Council as education authority. As the governing authority in terms of catchment areas, much of the funding and often, landowners, its advice is sought and acted upon</p> <p>The Council's own 2011 report was questioned for its objectivity by the Planning Inspector in the Kites Nest Lane appeal and for that reason an impartial report was commissioned on which to base all allocations for a 15 year period. This is monitored and adjustments made depending upon progress and further assessments as sites come forward</p> <p>Sites are proposed largely in the south of the district as this is where there is non-green belt land. Government policy states that this is land which should be used before Green Belt land is considered, unless there are special circumstances. Not all of the sites will</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Proposals will provide for more gypsies and travellers than currently resident within the District's boundaries</p> <p>Sites should be considered within the New Local Plan and not as a separate exercise</p> <p>Sites within the existing urban areas of Kenilworth, Warwick and Leamington should have been identified for Gypsies and Travellers. Such sites would be more suitable and sustainable, and would better integrate into the local communities.</p> <p>WDC should revisit its Greenbelt Policy and release sites to the north of Warwick and Leamington</p> <p>There is no mention of such sites in the Local Plan. However the Local Plan is unsound without a commitment to meeting gypsy and traveller needs. Therefore the Local Plan, and the consultations for both the Gypsy and travellers' site and the proposed development of new housing, appear unfit for purpose and ought to be revised and reissued</p>	<p>be needed. We only need sufficient land to accommodate 31 pitches over a 15 year period (25 in the first 5 years)</p> <p>This is because, as an authority, we move Gypsies and Travellers on as quickly as is allowed. The absence of sites does not mean that we do not have a need or that there are no Gypsies and Travellers wishing to live here. Additionally we have a 'hidden' need amongst those living in conventional housing in the district</p> <p>The Gypsy and Traveller Development Plan Document (DPD) is part of the Local Plan and there are policies relating to the provision of the sites within the Local Plan document</p> <p>Sites within the urban area have been considered at all stages and particularly where they have been specifically suggested through the consultation process. However, Travellers prefer to live on the periphery of towns and villages where they are less close to the settled community and therefore more likely to be accepted, but close enough to utilise facilities and services available</p> <p>Policies H7, H8 and H9 of the Local Plan are specifically about the provision of sites for the Gypsy and Traveller community and the Council states that it will produce an allocations DPD which is what we are now</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Why is it necessary to provide sites within the district when a site in the Ryton area is underused?</p> <p>If a site does not meet with the Governments advice concerning deliverability, and is therefore not a realistically viable option, then it should not be classified as a Preferred Option Such an approach would not be justified or effective, rendering any such allocation 'unsound.' The Pre Submission Draft version of the Plan necessarily needs to address this issue</p> <p>In order to be consistent, both in terms of how sites were initially identified for Gypsies and Travellers housing needs and how housing sites have been identified through the Local Plan process for non-Gypsy and Traveller needs, the Green Belt boundaries should have been reviewed to ascertain whether any sites could be released from the Green Belt in order to meet Gypsy and Traveller housing needs. The lack of a consistent approach to site identification and allocation makes the Plan unsound and thus will undermine any attempts to use CPO powers</p> <p>Why should non- tax payers be given a prime location in beautiful countryside when tax paying residents would love to live there but simply can't afford to. It is a very unfair system</p> <p>Do not support the allocation of any sites. Concerned that they will lead to anti-social behaviour of various kinds</p>	<p>doing</p> <p>The site at Ryton is in two ownerships: part belongs to Rugby Borough Council (it is within their boundary) and the other is privately owned. Neither Rugby BC or Warwick DC have control over who purchases/rents on the private site. There are no vacancies on the part owned by Rugby BC and there is a waiting list for pitches here. Any vacancies that do arise will be to serve Rugby's need</p> <p>Agreed</p> <p>This is something that we are doing</p> <p>Gypsies and Travellers are also tax payers. Some, as in the case of the settled community may not be however</p> <p>There is no reason to believe that this will be the case and is not the view given by the Police. If anti-social behaviour does occur</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>WDC are currently preparing their Development Plan and thus have an opportunity for a full review of the Green Belt throughout the whole district. Section 9 of the NPPF about protecting Green Belt land also makes it clear that the Local Plan is an opportunity to review the boundaries of the Green Belt. Clear that the opportunity exists for WDC to extend its area of search for suitable sites in sustainable locations by redefining and tweaking Green Belt boundaries in the north of the district- some 80% of the total district area. Search area should have included other sustainable locations within the district including those within the Green Belt. These locations should have included the primary service villages of Bishops Tachbrook, Cubbington, Hampton Magna, Kingswood (Lapworth), Radford Semele and the secondary service villages, Baginton, Burton Green, Hatton Park and Leek Wootton. By comprehensive master-planning there is an ideal opportunity to fully integrate the new facilities properly within the urban extensions. These are all in sustainable locations close to existing and proposed community facilities such as shops, schools, bus routes etc. urban extension sites must be deliverable, available and viable otherwise the council would not have put them forward. The landowners and developers may prefer the traveller sites to go elsewhere but their schemes are easily large enough to take the new site(s)</p> <p>Transit sites are required more urgently than permanent sites to alleviate the problem of illegal encampments</p> <p>Aim – should make their own assessment – Failed – clearly an outsourced, arms-length study – not objective</p>	<p>it could emanate from any community within the district</p> <p>See above</p> <p>The GTAA establishes that there is a need for both permanent and transit sites, however, WCC has stated its intention (and now has planning permission for one site in the south) to provide emergency stopping places to meet the needs of the districts</p> <p>The Council's own 2011 report was questioned for its objectivity by the Planning Inspector in the Kites Nest Lane appeal and for that</p>
--	--	--	---

		<p>Aim – authorities working collaboratively, develop fair and effective strategies – Failed – no realistic collaboration with settled communities – definitely not fair</p> <p>Aim – includes fair realistic policies – failed – the vast majority of proposals cannot be inclusive for multiple reasons</p> <p>Aim – reduce tensions between settled and Traveller communities – Failed – amateur, superficial and lazy initial stages have merely stoked concerns on both sides</p> <p>Aim – provision of suitable accommodation – failed – in many/most of proposals</p> <p><i>Local Plan Process</i></p> <p>Concern that the bureaucratic system for preparing Local Plans is such that by time proposals presented to residents they seem to be 'fait accompli'. There appears to be general dissatisfaction with the whole [plan making] process. Also lack of information on what actions local MPs are</p>	<p>reason an impartial report was commissioned on which to base all allocations for a 15 year period. This is monitored and adjustments made depending upon progress and further assessments as sites come forward</p> <p>All communities have the opportunity to become involved through the consultation</p> <p>Policies lay down why and how sites will be allocated and what the criteria to be employed are. It isn't possible to provide a site that meets all of these criteria, however the Council has tried to identify sites that meet the majority</p> <p>The Council has started a new initiative whereby the settled community and representatives of the Gypsy and Traveller community can meet and discuss their needs and concerns. Much hostility and negativity is produced through a lack of understanding and fear of the unknown. This initiative aims to overcome some of these issues That is what we are aiming to do through this DPD</p> <p>This is not an issue for the Gypsy and Traveller consultation process to consider.</p>
--	--	---	---

		<p>taking to over-turn damaging central proposals including HS2, and large population increase as part of the Local Plan despite obvious pressure on local infrastructure and services</p> <p>Proposed allocations or reserve sites have not been discussed with traveller communities which is key requirement of 'Planning Policy for Traveller Sites'</p> <p>Council does not intend to own or manage sites but intend G&T to purchase sites themselves. Consultation document states that this decision has been reached by observing experience of other local authorities as opposed to meaningful discussion with G&T themselves or even other Local Authorities from whose experience they refer</p> <p>Traveller communities should rent or buy their own sites</p>	<p>This is certainly not the case. Officers are in regular contact with members of the Gypsy and Traveller community who are looking for sites in the district</p> <p>See above Warwick District Council has a number of neighbouring districts all of whom have sites which they manage themselves and much has been learned from their experience together with other districts around the country. Additionally the majority of Local Authorities who do own sites and rent them out, can no longer afford to do so given the government cut backs and loss of other income. Warwick DC is no different in this regard</p> <p>This is what is being proposed</p>
<p>Summary of alternative sites</p>		<p>There are no photographs of the Alternative Sites provided, unlike for the Preferred Sites in section 9. This is arguably prejudicial as all sites should be given the same treatment in the documentation.</p> <p>Understand the pitches on the A46 were offered for use by travellers but declined. (The old Little Chef site). This would be the only site would consider, but do not appreciate why any site should be</p>	<p>The majority of respondents will be aware of the appearance of all sites as they are local to them, however, it was felt that a visual representation of just those sites which are the Preferred Options would remind consultees of the sites which come under that category</p> <p>The two sites off the A46 (former Little Chef) were not offered, but were thought to be worthy</p>

		<p>offered. Would also appreciate an understanding of the costs for these sites and who will pay</p> <p>Unclear why some sites were originally identified if there are now key reasons why they are not suitable</p> <p>Some red sites declared unsuitable when they may be suitable (GT01, GT11)</p> <p>Larger, rather than smaller sites to be commended, lowering pitch cost and impact on fewer communities</p>	<p>of consideration. The site owner was willing to consider such a use. The Highways Authority however objected to the use of the existing accesses and to any new accesses being formed. Additionally, in view of the noise and air quality immediately adjacent to the A46, health issues also combined to make both sites unacceptable</p> <p>The consultation for the 'options' put forward ideas of where sites may be acceptable in terms of location and sustainability. Detailed work followed, (including the results of the public consultation) which contributed to the overall choice of the Preferred Options. This is an iterative process common to all Plan production</p> <p>See above</p> <p>Government guidance seeks to limit sites to a maximum of 15 pitches based on best practice elsewhere</p>
<p>Sites Summary Table</p>		<p>Suggested better site GT20 by the M40 as this has better access with New Dispensary Surgery and schools nearby</p> <p>Rejection of Siskin Drive without explanation is regrettable. The existence of the official site there, with no adverse environmental or social effects, indicates the general suitability of this area. It has good road access and does not involve use of minor roads, and there are no private houses nearby. It should be possible for a Warwick District Council site to be located adjacent to or near the Coventry City Council site GT01</p> <p>Should be included as AMBER (at least) and progressed.</p> <p>Investigate/elucidate/address any issues</p>	<p>Reasons for rating sites the way we have can be seen in the Site Assessments and the Sustainability Assessment</p>

		<p>on this site. Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low. Houses are already immediately adjacent to A46 elsewhere. Can negotiate the design access GT07 Should be 'Amber' Should challenge Green Belt paradigm Issues possibly overstated: Coventry is NOT a busy or noisy airport anymore; access is clearly possible GT07 Should be 'Amber' Should challenge Green Belt paradigm Issues possibly overstated: Coventry is NOT a busy or noisy airport anymore; access is clearly possible GT09 Should be an 'Amber' site and although probably not popular with either Barford or Bishops Tachbrook villages it needs further evaluation. Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low-medium GT10 Should be a 'Green' site and although probably not popular with either Barford or Bishops Tachbrook villages it needs to be more thoroughly evaluated. Access issues are grossly overstated and landfill part of the site would not be required for this development. Impact of noise from M40 not likely to be any worse than parts of Bishops Tachbrook. Sensitivity of existing use markedly overstated. Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low-medium GTalt 6 Perhaps it should be considered for and integrated properly. Costs/mitigation/compensation would be medium GTalt7 It seems to only have been rejected on Green Belt issues. This should be a 'Green' site. Impact on local character would be no worse than GT12 and no more difficult to achieve access than GT08. Covenant on site can be overcome in the 'public interest'. Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low – medium GTalt08 Should be 'Amber' and considered further. Allocation from employment use can change especially as we are in a time of flux with Local Plan They can be integrated/adjacent to</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>industrial areas Recent planning permission for GTalt01 seems to have been disregarded, so maybe not an issue here either? Costs/mitigation/compensation would be medium GTalt9 Should be 'Amber' and considered further. Allocation from employment use can change especially as we are in a time of flux with Local Plan Sites can be integrated/adjacent to other uses. Costs/mitigation/compensation would be medium GTalt11 Should be considered further and marked as 'Amber' In many ways this could be an ideal "wider location/area of search" Gypsies and travellers could meet site's rural based employment allocation Already significant residential numbers in the vicinity If intensification of access and issue here then it calls into question many other sites Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low GTalt14 There is housing and employment use very near this location. Smells from the sewage works are probably overstated WDC should review all sites on East of Stratford Road from Longbridge through to the conventional Stratford Road houses - this area would be an ideal site and is set back and screened to protect from the tourist route Costs/mitigation/compensation would be medium GTalt16 Should be included as 'amber' (at least) and progressed Need to investigate/elucidate/address Green Belt issue This would be the very best opportunity to integrate gypsy and traveller requirements into a bigger scheme Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low – medium GTalt17 Should be included as 'Amber' and progressed There is housing and employment use very near this location and so is another good opportunity to integrate gypsies and travellers in a planned manner Costs/mitigation/compensation would be low – medium</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>GT03 Agree with Council's decision</p> <p>GT13 It has been through the legal process and probably should not be challenged</p> <p>GT14 A very small site/contribution to solution so probably not worth pursuing</p> <p>GT16 Agree - an unsuitable proposal</p> <p>GT17 Agree - an unsuitable proposal</p> <p>GT18 Agree - an unsuitable proposal</p> <p>GT20 Agree - an unsuitable proposal</p> <p>GTalt4 Agree - an unsuitable proposal</p> <p>GTalt5 Agree - an unsuitable proposal</p> <p>GTalt10 Agree - an unsuitable proposal</p> <p>GTalt13 Agreed - unsuitable proposal</p> <p>GTalt15 Agreed but justifications are unconvincing</p> <p>GTalt18 Agreed - unsuitable proposal</p> <p>GTalt19 Agreed but justifications are unconvincing</p> <p>GTalt20 Agreed but justifications are unconvincing</p> <p>GTalt21 Agreed but justifications are unconvincing</p> <p>GTalt22 Agreed but justifications are unconvincing and could have been an ideal site given existing uses</p> <p>GTalt23 Agreed but justifications are unconvincing Wellesbourne is currently being expanded with 1600 houses on the airfield and would be highly suitable for a traveller site as the Town sits in open countryside where traffic has to travel at slower speeds (4 Roundabouts currently on the</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>main road) Too many sites are focussed around Barford and Bishops Tachbrook, neither of whom can accommodate this level of development. Also given the relatively small numbers of existing villages, it makes it harder for these villages to mount a sufficiently robust campaign against these sites, than say larger conurbations</p> <p>Objects to GTalt24 - land off M40 junction at Sherbourne It is agricultural land which is fully farmed It regularly floods for long periods during the year No facilities in the nearby village Existing permitted G&T site (SDC) up Sherbourne Hill</p> <p>Objects to GT20 - This is within the green belt and is good quality agricultural land The site lies along a noisy road There is already a nearby site in SDC up Sherbourne Hill Are hospital/GP services sufficient (including midwifery services) to cope with increasing populations? Similarly, are social services, educational facilities, the police, and local authority able to meet the increasing demands? Services are already at their limits and require additional funding if additional needs are to be met.</p> <p>Document states as a supporting factor: "Possible use of existing access points" but there is no credible solution for allowing large vehicles to turn into a constrained site off a busy road. How does this compare with the commentary for site GTalt22: "Access would have to be shared with Camping and Caravan Club access", which is presented as a negative</p> <p>Gypsy and traveller sites within Warwick District must be owned and operated by either the District Council or a specialist Housing Association. Either of these bodies will provide much more effective long term management and remove risk associated with ineffectual governance or public accountability. In the case of District Council management, it will be able to take direct and immediate action against any planning or environmental breaches or other concerns</p> <p>Warwick and Leamington There are no suitable sites in the area which would not damage the character of Leamington</p>	
--	--	---	--

		<p>The siting of all the G&T sites south of river causes concern. Sites to the north of the river that were previously identified have not now been included</p> <p>Do not understand reasons for not considering GT01 and GTalt16 If reasons include partial flood zones and smells emanating from sludge lagoons then not suitable for employment either Huge areas of land - surely small area could be used for Gypsy/Traveller site. WDC owns part of land so no CPO needed. When Council owns land that could be made available, this should be considered</p> <p>Original site list was waste of time and resources – conducted in incompetent manner. Alternative sites which followed marginally more enlightened, however the assessments were inconsistent and final grading mostly poorly justified and inconsistent</p> <p>Some sites so blatantly unsuitable that they should never have made it through to any lists, never mind the preferred options consultation</p>	
<p>GTAA</p>		<p>The Salford report has not been validated and may not be accurate/relevant to establishing the need identified Proposals will provide more pitches/accommodation than are necessary</p> <p>The assessment from Salford University contains no adequate "demonstration of the need for 31 pitches", the public was not consulted in its production and as the sole basis of the Council's policy, it is unreliable and unsound</p> <p>The GTAA was published in November 2012.</p> <p>Study that was used to establish the requirement for gypsy sites is out of date and flawed and has been driven by the current affairs at that time. The requirement for these sites at all needs review. Research not done locally and gypsies were actually involved in direction of research</p>	<p>The report produced by the research team at the Salford Housing and Urban Studies unit of Salford University carried out the Gypsy and Traveller Accommodation Assessment (GTAA) on behalf of the Council. When a specialised piece of work is required as part of the Council's evidence base, the Council often employs specialists in that field to produce the work. This piece of work was no exception. The research team is highly experienced and have produced a number of GTAAs and have also be asked to check the work of others who have similarly worked on GTAAs The planning policy and housing</p>

		<p>Other sites in Warwickshire are not fully used by travellers; there is no need for more or certainly not at the scale proposed. The report identifying the need is out of date and therefore the validity flawed. The number of travellers who need sites does not add up and WDC should publish information on this</p>	<p>departments of the Council worked closely with the research team and were critical throughout the process to ensure a robust and accurate report resulted. With a subject such as Gypsies and Travellers, it is difficult to speak to the whole of the community who are largely and not surprisingly suspicious of authority and questions about their background and movements. The research team have for some years therefore employed two members of that community to ask pre-prepared questions of the Gypsies and Travellers in the relevant area to elicit a more dependable, genuine response. Because they share the same background, they are able to find out far more than Council officers or academics could ever hope to. The general public would not have been consulted on this or any other piece of evidence which the Council then uses to draw its own conclusions and which assists it to produce its own reports</p> <p>There are no sites in Warwickshire with vacancies which could be utilised by this authority. Where sites are located in other districts, those districts need them to meet their own requirement. Warwick DC has no provision whatsoever and has a responsibility to provide the number of</p>
--	--	---	---

			pitches identified as local need in the GTAA. See previous response for information about the GTAA
Duty to co-operate		<p>WDC consultation does not consider the existing capacity of current sites within Warwickshire and other adjacent districts Warwick District has failed to collaborate with adjacent Districts and in particular Stratford / Rugby Warwick and Stratford DC are out of phase with their consultations so logically they cannot collaborate as required by Govt. policy</p> <p>The public deserves more information on why conversations with neighbouring authorities over several years have not yielded any results</p> <p>Why have discussions with neighbouring authorities not yielded any results?</p> <p>As part of the duty to co-operate Stratford DC have a site at Blackhill</p>	<p>Warwick District Council does not have any existing sites. There are sites throughout other areas of the County but these service those districts and if need be, will be extended to meet their own need. Plans rarely run in tandem. It is still possible to collaborate</p> <p>See above</p> <p>The site will be needed to count toward the Stratford DC need</p>
Compulsory Purchase		<p>Cost of CPO has not been weighed against the use of potentially cheaper brownfield options</p> <p>Compulsory purchase is unfair in order for the G&T community to operate the site as a business</p> <p>Cost to taxpayer</p> <p>Essential that should Council call upon compulsory purchase powers, appropriate, fully representative values for land/loss of income be used so affected landowners are fully compensated for any loss to their business. Talk of compulsory purchase only seeks to undermine consultation exercises leading to distrust on both sides</p> <p>Use of CPO thought inappropriate by government ministers</p> <p>Why do Local Councils feel the need to compulsory purchase land that has belonged to generations of families to sell to the traveller community? Landowners have as much right to keep their land just as travellers claim the right to have places to reside whilst travelling?</p>	<p>Compulsory purchase is seen as a last resort. It will only be necessary if there is no other way of delivering sites to meet the need over the 15 year period laid out in the GTAA</p>

		<p>Unfair to make an individual give up their land at a minimal price for others to make profit on</p> <p>Opposes the use of compulsory purchase even 'as a last resort'. Draconian that one private landlord is forced to sell land to another private landlord, so that the site can be used for a commercial purpose. Compulsory purchase is inappropriate and should be reserved for only major infrastructure projects. It is also inappropriate for landowners to feel threat of this action during a 'consultation' process</p> <p>No costings have been provided for using CPO powers and the loss of livelihood of those involved. The council is ignoring government advice if it intends to use CPO powers for such matters</p> <p>Site selection process is flawed and has not been adequately evidenced or explained, which will undermine the Council's case. The time and costs involved in the CPO process mean that there is no guarantee that the sites can be delivered in a reasonable timescale or at all and therefore cannot be considered as deliverable. This in turn makes the Plan unsound</p> <p>The CPO process is uncertain and subject to a public inquiry. The timescales for a CPO are variable but it is not realistic to expect it to take any less than three to four years. This means the site is not available now</p> <p>Although CPO powers are strong, the local authority must be able to demonstrate that forcefully acquiring the land is necessary and that there is a 'compelling case in the public interest' - the legal test for a CPO. No compelling case for the forceful state acquisition of a land from a private landowner and then onward sale to a private third party landlord for the benefit of just 8 families. Weighed against this benefit for just 8 families are the dis-benefits to the land owner and other parties affected by the new development. Successful CPO's relate to a specific site that is needed for a specific and unique purpose. This is not the case with a new traveller site. The land to the north of Westham Lane is not the only land in the district that could satisfy the need for an 8 pitch traveller site -there are many options some of which are set out in the 'Alternative Sites' section below. A CPO land acquisition strategy is high risk for the Council.</p>	
--	--	--	--

		<p>Understand there have been no successful CPO cases in England for a new traveller site. Only one local authority has attempted to secure a traveller site using a CPO process. On 17th April 2012 Secretary of State accepted Inspector's recommendation not to confirm Mid Suffolk District Council CPO order for land at Combs Lane Finbrough. Ref LDN023/W3520/006/0002/001. A CPO process could also be very expensive exercise for the District Council bringing viability into question.</p> <p>Very risky and possibly expensive strategy to rely on CPO's. Inspector at EIP could consider such a strategy unsound as it does not guarantee delivery now</p> <p>Council should seek a mandate from ratepayers before embarking on an expensive and hazardous policy of using CPO powers</p>	
Government policy		<p>Government is considering the abolition of the G and T requirement in Local Plans</p> <p>Government is considering the case for changes to the planning definition of 'travellers' to reflect whether it should only refer to those who actually travel and have a mobile or transitory lifestyle</p> <p>Government intends strengthen green belt protection in this regard. Brings into question whole issue of whether or not permanent sites are required and begs the question about prematurity of Council's proposals until matter is resolved</p>	In the absence of any new legislation or direction from the government, the Council has to work within the current framework
Green Belt		<p>WDC is failing in its duties by not challenging the function and performance of the greenbelt north of Warwick and Leamington (a 1950s designation with the main aim of preventing Birmingham and Coventry from merging. Its function and performance can and should be reviewed in this District). Instead you are blindly piling development pressure including the gypsy and traveller sites on our rural communities in the south of the District. In the south we feel embattled and that our interests are not represented by our Council leaders</p>	This has been done through the Local Plan
Other		<p>This is a reasonable selection of sites</p> <p>No adequate rationale given for the Council not owning or managing the sites</p> <p>Who will the Council sell sites to and will it achieve best value?</p>	<p>It is too expensive and a drain on reduced resources</p> <p>Sites will be sold to members of the Gypsy</p>

		<p>Council (or registered social landlord) needs to retain accountability for managing and controlling the sites and securing all relevant planning permissions</p> <p>The possibility of adding pitches at a later date through the planning process exposes this entire process to abuse and manipulation and offers local residents no certainty</p> <p>Has Government/WDC consulted with Gypsy Traveller Community?</p> <p>Concern over cost and upkeep of the sites</p> <p>Many people are unaware of the requirement to respond to this second consultation, feeling that they have already made their feeling known the first time</p> <p>Put money toward improving local public transport services instead</p> <p>Allocation is being pushed through to meet an unsubstantiated objective without due regard to following process, adhering to national guidelines or actual local need</p>	<p>and Traveller community, to a social housing provider or private landowners can also apply for planning permission to set up a site. Planning applications will have to be made to WDC and determined in the usual way</p> <p>This can be the best way to deal with future need, but a maximum number of pitches will be accepted and beyond that number a new application will be needed which may not succeed if it increases the number of pitches to intensify the density above that considered manageable</p> <p>Yes, we are working with a number of families who wish to buy land and develop their own sites. Their views on potential sites are an important part of deciding the best locations as we want sites we allocate to be used</p> <p>This will not fall on the Council/Council Tax</p> <p>People have asked about this and been told that it is a new stage of the development of the Plan and another response is required</p> <p>The Council is not spending any money on sites and is in any case, not responsible for the provision of public transport</p> <p>The GTAA has provided the evidence of need and WDC is responsible for meeting that need</p>
--	--	--	--

		<p>The consultation was/is flawed the times from 4-30 -6-30 were a farce with most people being at work. The consultation is confusing with most people believing they have already forwarded their comments previously</p> <p>What is public being consulted upon? Consultation appears to relate just to residential sites for travellers. The PPTS 2012 is binding planning policy guidance and directs that Local Planning Authorities should consider wherever possible including traveller sites suitable for mixed residential/business uses having regard to safety/amenity of occupants/neighbouring residents. Such sites would have more negative impact</p> <p>WDC has given no real indication of what the new facility might look like making responding on consultation difficult</p> <p>Limiting the number of pitches per site increases the number of sites and if this is done for site management reasons it reinforces local residents concerns about such sites</p> <p>Noted that the allocation/planning application for development at Europa Way includes the provision of local facilities but the timescale for delivering this is unknown and therefore cannot be relied upon when looking to allocate gypsy/traveller sites at this stage</p> <p>Whilst many will be relieved that the</p>	<p>through the NPPF and Housing Act</p> <p>The majority of 'drop in' sessions were staffed before and after these times, however, there were also sessions at supermarkets to catch people on their way home from work and also an event held at the weekend. There were other ways open to people to find out information at other times e.g. Council's website, One Stop Shops and at Council offices or by phone/email</p> <p>Some, but not all Gypsy and Traveller families may wish to have some business use within the site. This will be considered as part of a planning application at a later stage and controlled by appropriate policies</p> <p>WDC has reproduced some photographs in the Preferred Options document of sites that are of sites that have been recently opened elsewhere. We have none of our own as yet to illustrate this</p> <p>This is the guidance set down by Government about the optimum size of sites of 5-15 pitches</p> <p>The Local Plan is at a similar stage to the Gypsy and Traveller DPD. Where new sites are proposed in the Local Plan, these now have sufficient weight to allow a certain amount of reliance</p> <p>In the light of new</p>
--	--	---	--

		transit requirement is to be met outside the district, it is not realistic to believe that it will stop the informal camps such as suffered continually in this area	advice from WCC, WDC will meet its own transit requirement to ensure there are sufficient places to direct illegally encamped persons
--	--	--	---

Suggested changes to plan	
GT02	Remove from consideration
GT02 and GTalt01	Offer the most sensible alternative and fit most of the criteria
GT04	Reassess site in view of new housing development proposed in vicinity
GTalt01	Strongly encourage consideration of other potential sites. Should be reclassified as red
GTalt03	Inappropriate development and should be reclassified as 'red'
GT05	Should be amber Should be red
GT06	Should be reduced to red
GT08	Should be green site
GT11	Should be red
GT11, 17 and 18	Should all be discounted
GT12	Should be reduced to red
GT15	Should be reduced to amber Should be red
GT19	Land used for cattery/kennels and sales of logs. Renovate existing facilities for original purposes
Locating within new developments	A longer term solution, surely, would be to provide larger G & T sites within the planning of new, larger mixed developments which will surely happen with the introduction of the Local Plan. This makes sense both economically and from a planning point of view. Will give WDC the opportunity to address all the Gypsy and Traveller's needs at the planning stage rather than imposing them on existing communities and would be less obvious Communities will naturally form and facilities shared Depressing to think that this proactive approach is not being pursued because of the unhealthy influence the major house builders and developers
GT02, GT05, GTalt01, GT19	All good sites
GT06, GT08, GT11, GTalt02, GTalt03, GTalt12	Unsuitable Must be better site to avoid wasting village volunteers hard work
GT08	Include as brownfield land north of WDC which spreads the burden
	review their site selection strategy and concentrate on sites that would fulfil the following main criteria: Are genuinely deliverable and available now. I.e. a willing land owner wishes to promote the site. Candidate Sites should be tested for viability. Sites not on best and most versatile agricultural land Sites that would be safe and offer good living conditions for the new residents. In doing so the council should be less opaque about the form and uses of the final developments proposed From a cursory review of the Council's information it would seem that the current sites that may meet the relevant criteria would be: GT04, GT15, GT19, GTalt01, GT11 and GTalt3. However as well as these sites the Council should consider its

	options under a green Belt Review and most importantly including a requirement that space be set aside in the proposed sustainable urban extensions
GT19	The proposals for a marina, restaurant and conference centre should be given consideration
	Use a small portion of the land proposed for housing to west of Europa Way
	Move some sites to the north of the District
	GT01 and GT19 may be better options
	Reappraise GB boundaries
	Leave GT19 as it is or use as extension to leisure on canal
Other	Spend money on brownfield site nearer Leamington Spa
	Revoke plan
	Retract statement in document (GT19 above) and consultation process can be restarted
	Properly weighted objective scoring system should be used in totally transparent way. Traffic light systems artistic but not scientific, not measureable, largely subjective and not even consistent across sites
	Revert to national guidance to use sites of c25 pitches throughout
	A sensibly priced and properly designed secure transit site should be placed within larger swathes of new development at earliest stage of development
	Criteria should be appropriately weighted and objectively and consistently applied
	Aim to reduce requirement to 2 or max 3 sites over the district
	More work should have been done before arriving at this stage to avoid unnecessarily distressing local residents
	Do not locate in vicinity of large residential developments
Alternative Sites	
	Suggest the Council considers the former Ford Foundry Car Park in Leamington Spa as an alternative site. The car park is discrete, relatively secure, close to employment opportunities, transit services, shops, schools, Health and Hospital facilities
	A small site could be integrated within the proposal at Lillington, away from the rest of the towns/villages
	There are more suitable sites that have not been raised by WDC: a. Land off Poseidon Way and Spartan Close. Travellers regularly use this area. b. Land off Dobson Lane Whitnash. Located at the back of the cemetery and Whitnash school. Both the sites are walking distance from schools and other essential local amenities.
	Suggested that Council consider, on the 2 affordable housing sites recently included in the publication draft of the local plan, Orbit/Deeley at Sydenham and Riverside House redevelopment sites, that, within each of those developments, 3 separate single plots are slipped in between normal affordable housing. Each plot would have a normal access to the street, a small bungalow amenity building and space for caravans and vehicle parking designed to fit in with the normal housing. They could look to be a natural part of the housing development, similar to a normal house where the owner parks their caravan in their garden next to a bungalow. As a permanent site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It could be offered to those who are not tied to a large group, who might choose to value getting involved in a wider community and could get close to, but not next

	<p>door to other members of their family group in much the same way that the settled community does.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • For the children of those families it would give them a wider educational opportunity to reach their potential, rather than being obliged to be constrained to traditional traveller's ways. • For the potential wage earner it would give a wider choice of employment opportunities. For the settled community neighbours, the chances of problems are reduced by the dissipation of the number of sites. <p>The Guidance gives an example in Annex 3b, Small Scale site in urban locations, with a plot about 10m by 20m (200m²) as compared with the 500m² per pitch suggested for a set of pitches with internal roads. Services and drainage would cost less, being part of a larger development, so this arrangement is probably the least expensive cost per pitch to provide.</p> <p>The operational management method for Gypsies & Traveller Permanent sites.</p> <p>Should be operated by independent body that can offer pitches fairly to gypsy traveller applicants, with fair rents and resources to maintain the facility and set the way that non-compliance with fair rules can terminate the tenure</p> <p>WDC shows no appetite to run such sites, so interest should be invited from interested housing associations to purchase the site, finance, build, maintain and manage it.</p> <p>Could also include implementation of ways of encouraging a greater sense of community with shared interests of the settled and travelling residents.</p>
	Have you tried by Warwick Racecourse?
	A gypsy site near a large centre such as Coventry would be a better location
	Better to locate these sites in towns nearer the facilities and services. Land near Leamington Railway Station or Warwick Fields would be possible alternatives
	The consultation document should clarify the difference between the capacity (potential number of pitches) and recommended maximum number of pitches for each site. It will avoid confusion that the potential number of pitches for a site corresponds with WDC's longer term aim for the number of pitches which can be accommodated on a site
	Was or is a site at Ryton which could be used
	M40 corridor
	What about enlarging present G & T camps even if they are in immediate locality to Warwick and Leamington, i.e. Pathlow and Shipston
	Land on the Stratford Road going into Warwick
	Kites Nest Lane – an established site tucked away with few local residents
	Land south of A46 and north of race course has slow existing access for merging traffic into the flow
	Preferred sites should not be in green belt
	Prefer industrial brown field sites but these not in keeping with criteria
	Nr A46/M40/B4465 used in construction of new road
	Any site receiving zero objections
	Vacant land near A46 at end of Watery Lane
	Maximise use of minimum number of sites
Sustainability Appraisal	
	The Council appears to have ignored its own Sustainability Appraisal and evidence base: assessments for GT15 and

	<p>GTalt01 identify more negative than positive effects and therefore allocating these as preferred sites will result in unsustainable development. Similarly, GT02 has more positive than negative effects and would be a more sustainable form of development than GT15 or GTalt01 but is not a preferred site. GTalt03 also has more positive than negative effects and so should be removed from the Green Belt and promoted as a Preferred Site i.e. 'Green' rather than a Potentially Suitable Site i.e. 'Amber'. The Council needs to make its site selection process available for inspection</p>
--	---