

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 1: Sample

RES ID	RESPONDENT NAME	REP ID	SUBMISSION METHOD
142	D Lawrie [142]	48347	Email
142	D Lawrie [142]	48346	Email
178	Opus Land Ltd [178]	48225	Email
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46271	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46274	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	47028	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46265	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46264	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46263	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46266	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46273	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46270	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46258	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46318	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46257	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46268	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46262	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46269	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46272	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46267	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46261	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46260	Web
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	46259	Web
242	Mr and Mrs Kane [242]	48421	Email
242	Mr and Mrs Kane [242]	48423	Email
330	Mr Richard LAW [330]	48434	Email
330	Mr Richard LAW [330]	48435	Email
363	Dave Smith [363]	47225	Web
424	Barbara Hingley [424]	48815	Email
424	Barbara Hingley [424]	48818	Email
424	Barbara Hingley [424]	48813	Email
563	Mr G E Cooper [563]	47868	Paper
563	Mr G E Cooper [563]	49568	Paper
563	Mr G E Cooper [563]	49567	Paper
740	Mr Brian Lewis [740]	48651	Email
740	Mr Brian Lewis [740]	48658	Email
740	Mr Brian Lewis [740]	48656	Email
740	Mr Brian Lewis [740]	48660	Email
740	Mr Brian Lewis [740]	48653	Email
1525	Mr David Jordan [1525]	50534	Paper
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	49522	Paper
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	49525	Paper
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	49528	Paper
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	49530	Paper
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	49531	Paper
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	49520	Paper
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	49523	Paper
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	49524	Paper
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	49521	Paper

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 1: Sample

RES ID	RESPONDENT NAME	REP ID	SUBMISSION METHOD
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	49529	Paper
2806	B C Grantham [2806]	50536	Paper
3027	Cliffe Allotments Association (M. Jane Boynton) [3027]	49813	Paper
3844	Mr Andrew Watkins [3844]	46930	Web
3844	Mr Andrew Watkins [3844]	46936	Web
4287	Mr and Mrs K Richards [4287]	49470	Email
4287	Mr and Mrs K Richards [4287]	49471	Email
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47174	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47173	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47172	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47171	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47168	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47169	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47165	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47196	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47167	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47177	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	46966	Web
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	47175	Web
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48765	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	49725	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48767	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	49723	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	49724	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48774	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48766	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48781	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48775	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	49726	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48773	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48769	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48777	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48776	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48772	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48768	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48770	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48771	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48779	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48778	Paper
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	48780	Paper
5130	La Salle Investments [5130]	49378	Email
5130	La Salle Investments [5130]	49379	Email
5130	La Salle Investments [5130]	49376	Email
5130	La Salle Investments [5130]	49375	Email
5130	La Salle Investments [5130]	49377	Email
5448	Mr William Blagburn [5448]	46418	Web
5448	Mr William Blagburn [5448]	46421	Web
5448	Mr William Blagburn [5448]	46422	Web

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 1: Sample

RES ID	RESPONDENT NAME	REP ID	SUBMISSION METHOD
5521	Mr Malcolm Glenn [5521]	47132	Web
5521	Mr Malcolm Glenn [5521]	47130	Web
5521	Mr Malcolm Glenn [5521]	47131	Web
5521	Mr Malcolm Glenn [5521]	47134	Web
5521	Mr Malcolm Glenn [5521]	47133	Web
5535	Mr & Mrs Cutler [5535]	49055	Email
5535	Mr & Mrs Cutler [5535]	49050	Email
5535	Mr & Mrs Cutler [5535]	49058	Email
5535	Mr & Mrs Cutler [5535]	49063	Email
5535	Mr & Mrs Cutler [5535]	49059	Email
5535	Mr & Mrs Cutler [5535]	49065	Email
5535	Mr & Mrs Cutler [5535]	49067	Email
5535	Mr & Mrs Cutler [5535]	49061	Email
5536	Mr Mark Green [5536]	48099	Email
5536	Mr Mark Green [5536]	48098	Email
5554	Mr Richard Poynter [5554]	46277	Web
5565	Martin and Stephanie Atkin [5565]	48665	Email
5565	Martin and Stephanie Atkin [5565]	48666	Email
5583	MR MARK DALE [5583]	46911	Web
5595	Mr Jonathan Lander [5595]	48789	Email
5595	Mr Jonathan Lander [5595]	48787	Email
5595	Mr Jonathan Lander [5595]	48788	Email
5595	Mr Jonathan Lander [5595]	48790	Email
5605	Mr Kenneth Froggatt [5605]	46420	Web
5605	Mr Kenneth Froggatt [5605]	46419	Web
5620	Miss Ann Crawford [5620]	47135	Web
5627	Professor David Wilson [5627]	50092	Paper
5627	Professor David Wilson [5627]	50407	Paper
5644	Mr Paul Welsh [5644]	46446	Web
5667	Mrs Kay Lock [5667]	46491	Web
5667	Mrs Kay Lock [5667]	46493	Web
6106	Mr. Roy Drew [6106]	47320	Web
6106	Mr. Roy Drew [6106]	47319	Web
6106	Mr. Roy Drew [6106]	47332	Web
6106	Mr. Roy Drew [6106]	47329	Web
6749	Mrs Patrica Kirk [6749]	49374	Paper
6749	Mrs Patrica Kirk [6749]	49363	Paper
6775	Mrs Dorothy G. James [6775]	49360	Paper
6775	Mrs Dorothy G. James [6775]	49359	Paper
5667	Mrs Kay Lock [5667]	46492	Web
5667	Mrs Kay Lock [5667]	46494	Web
5677	mrs susan morris [5677]	49566	Paper
5677	mrs susan morris [5677]	48316	Email
5680	j jordan [5680]	46510	Web
5680	j jordan [5680]	46509	Web
5680	j jordan [5680]	46508	Web
5707	Louise Griew [5707]	46576	Web
5721	Mr Clifford Young [5721]	50415	Email
5721	Mr Clifford Young [5721]	47688	Email

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 1: Sample

RES ID	RESPONDENT NAME	REP ID	SUBMISSION METHOD
5735	Ms Rachel Pope [5735]	46675	Web
5735	Ms Rachel Pope [5735]	46686	Web
5735	Ms Rachel Pope [5735]	46688	Web
5735	Ms Rachel Pope [5735]	46682	Web
5735	Ms Rachel Pope [5735]	46673	Web
5735	Ms Rachel Pope [5735]	46683	Web
5735	Ms Rachel Pope [5735]	46684	Web
5735	Ms Rachel Pope [5735]	46687	Web
5754	Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	46741	Web
5754	Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	46787	Web
5754	Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	46782	Web
5754	Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	46784	Web
5754	Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	46783	Web
5754	Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	46785	Web
5761	Dr Martin Davis [5761]	48597	Email
5761	Dr Martin Davis [5761]	48596	Email
5786	Mrs Diana Lester [5786]	46770	Web
5786	Mrs Diana Lester [5786]	46768	Web
5793	Mr Chris Mellard [5793]	48497	Email
5793	Mr Chris Mellard [5793]	48498	Email
5847	Mrs Gill Jaffray [5847]	47406	Web
5847	Mrs Gill Jaffray [5847]	47404	Web
5847	Mrs Gill Jaffray [5847]	47403	Web
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	46867	Web
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	46863	Web
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	46872	Web
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	46873	Web
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	46868	Web
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	46869	Web
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	46871	Web
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	46855	Web
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	46866	Web
5862	Leek Wootton Parish Plan Working Group (Mr Brian Melling) [5862]	47151	Web
5862	Leek Wootton Parish Plan Working Group (Mr Brian Melling) [5862]	47153	Web
5873	Mrs Gillian Crisp [5873]	46913	Web
5873	Mrs Gillian Crisp [5873]	46912	Web
5876	R Collier [5876]	46917	Web
5892	Coventry Gospel halls Trust (Mr Stephen Wheatcroft) [5892]	49623	Paper
5892	Coventry Gospel halls Trust (Mr Stephen Wheatcroft) [5892]	49622	Paper
5898	Mrs Marcella Smith [5898]	47099	Web
5898	Mrs Marcella Smith [5898]	47102	Web
5898	Mrs Marcella Smith [5898]	47095	Web
5917	Sara Barsley [5917]	46985	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47454	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts)	47335	Web

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 1: Sample

RES ID	RESPONDENT NAME	REP ID	SUBMISSION METHOD
	[5967]		
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47457	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47333	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47345	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47441	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47336	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47344	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47343	Web
6580	Warwickshire Gardens Trust (Christine Hodgetts) [6580]	47885	Email
6580	Warwickshire Gardens Trust (Christine Hodgetts) [6580]	47890	Email
6580	Warwickshire Gardens Trust (Christine Hodgetts) [6580]	47886	Email
7441	Mrs Margaret Clare [7441]	50533	Paper
7487	Laura Talamini [7487]	49885	Email
7487	Laura Talamini [7487]	49886	Email
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47346	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47338	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47354	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47341	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47334	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47353	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47339	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47340	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47347	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47440	Web
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	47342	Web
5973	Miss Susan Woolley [5973]	47059	Web
5975	Mr Mark Elliott [5975]	47066	Web
5997	Mr Keith Hillyard [5997]	48326	Email
5997	Mr Keith Hillyard [5997]	48325	Email
6014	mrs julie howard [6014]	47159	Web
6072	Mr David Reid [6072]	47322	Web
6072	Mr David Reid [6072]	47321	Web
6072	Mr David Reid [6072]	47318	Web
6083	Mr George Riches [6083]	47307	Web

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 1: Sample

RES ID	RESPONDENT NAME	REP ID	SUBMISSION METHOD
6106	Mr. Roy Drew [6106]	47317	Web
6106	Mr. Roy Drew [6106]	47316	Web
6106	Mr. Roy Drew [6106]	47331	Web
6120	Mr James Hosking [6120]	48323	Email
6120	Mr James Hosking [6120]	48321	Email
6133	Mr & Mrs John & Betty Green [6133]	49425	Paper
6133	Mr & Mrs John & Betty Green [6133]	49426	Paper
6138	Mrs Sarah Baumfield [6138]	47357	Web
6145	Mr J C Clack [6145]	49457	Email
6145	Mr J C Clack [6145]	49455	Email
6198	Mr Jonathan Stephens [6198]	47771	Email
6212	Mr Paul Birdsall [6212]	49427	Paper
6236	Oliver Le Maistre [6236]	47795	Paper
6236	Oliver Le Maistre [6236]	47796	Paper
6241	Dan Robbins [6241]	49971	Paper
6241	Dan Robbins [6241]	49828	Paper
6241	Dan Robbins [6241]	49973	Paper
6241	Dan Robbins [6241]	49912	Paper
6241	Dan Robbins [6241]	49914	Paper
6241	Dan Robbins [6241]	49836	Paper
6241	Dan Robbins [6241]	49829	Paper
6241	Dan Robbins [6241]	49918	Paper
6241	Dan Robbins [6241]	49822	Paper
6252	Steve Pailes [6252]	47984	Paper
6263	D. N. J. Green [6263]	47980	Paper
6263	D. N. J. Green [6263]	47981	Paper
6267	Ben Lane [6267]	47963	Paper
6267	Ben Lane [6267]	47964	Paper
6271	Brian Atkins [6271]	50441	Email
6271	Brian Atkins [6271]	47734	Email
6318	Carol Lane [6318]	50392	Email
6318	Carol Lane [6318]	47646	Email
6324	Pam Ciriani [6324]	47647	Email
6324	Pam Ciriani [6324]	50393	Email
6328	Eleanor Baldwin [6328]	47679	Email
6328	Eleanor Baldwin [6328]	50411	Email
6333	James & Ann Henly [6333]	47689	Email
6333	James & Ann Henly [6333]	50416	Email
6347	Jill Pugh [6347]	47723	Email
6359	Sue Mountford [6359]	47746	Email
6359	Sue Mountford [6359]	50444	Email
6394	Mr & Mrs Stuart & Katherine Ungless [6394]	48800	Email
6394	Mr & Mrs Stuart & Katherine Ungless [6394]	48801	Email
6399	Mr Peter Robbins [6399]	48048	Email
6399	Mr Peter Robbins [6399]	50337	Email
6399	Mr Peter Robbins [6399]	50338	Email
6399	Mr Peter Robbins [6399]	50336	Email
6399	Mr Peter Robbins [6399]	50334	Email
6399	Mr Peter Robbins [6399]	48049	Email

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 1: Sample

RES ID	RESPONDENT NAME	REP ID	SUBMISSION METHOD
6399	Mr Peter Robbins [6399]	50335	Email
6399	Mr Peter Robbins [6399]	50333	Email
6409	Highways Agency (Neil Hansen) [6409]	47962	Email
6417	Warwickshire County Council (Tim Willis) [6417]	47831	Email
6417	Warwickshire County Council (Tim Willis) [6417]	47834	Email
6417	Warwickshire County Council (Tim Willis) [6417]	47837	Email
6417	Warwickshire County Council (Tim Willis) [6417]	47836	Email
6446	Amrik Gill [6446]	47662	Email
6505	Mrs Mary Walsh [6505]	49467	Paper
6507	Mr Brian Jones [6507]	49940	Paper
6507	Mr Brian Jones [6507]	49938	Paper
6509	Helen Edwards [6509]	49904	Paper
6517	Mr Frederick Jennings [6517]	49466	Paper
6541	Amy Selby and Lee Hammond [6541]	47770	Email
6565	Mrs Diane Broadbent [6565]	49391	Paper
6580	Warwickshire Gardens Trust (Christine Hodgetts) [6580]	47892	Email
6580	Warwickshire Gardens Trust (Christine Hodgetts) [6580]	47891	Email
6580	Warwickshire Gardens Trust (Christine Hodgetts) [6580]	47889	Email
6580	Warwickshire Gardens Trust (Christine Hodgetts) [6580]	47893	Email
6580	Warwickshire Gardens Trust (Christine Hodgetts) [6580]	47888	Email
6595	Mrs Kathleen M Greenwood [6595]	50479	Email
6595	Mrs Kathleen M Greenwood [6595]	48003	Email
6783	Mr Timothy Loakes [6783]	49152	Paper
6783	Mr Timothy Loakes [6783]	48657	Paper
6783	Mr Timothy Loakes [6783]	48648	Paper
6783	Mr Timothy Loakes [6783]	48659	Paper
6783	Mr Timothy Loakes [6783]	48647	Paper
6783	Mr Timothy Loakes [6783]	48661	Paper
6857	Mrs Marianne Grantham [6857]	49273	Paper
6866	Anne Hastings [6866]	48034	Email
6875	Dr Sylvester Amab [6875]	48057	Email
6875	Dr Sylvester Amab [6875]	48058	Email
6894	Mr Richard Molloy [6894]	49292	Paper
6894	Mr Richard Molloy [6894]	49276	Paper
6894	Mr Richard Molloy [6894]	49293	Paper
6899	Mrs Estelle Barnett [6899]	49604	Paper
6900	Mr Mark Barnett [6900]	49600	Paper
6925	Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	49656	Paper
6925	Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	50006	Paper
6925	Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	50003	Paper
6925	Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	50000	Paper
6925	Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	50010	Paper

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 1: Sample

RES ID	RESPONDENT NAME	REP ID	SUBMISSION METHOD
6925	Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	50009	Paper
6925	Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	49994	Paper
6925	Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	49657	Paper
6925	Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	50004	Paper
6941	Ms Helen Tomlinson [6941]	50060	Paper
6941	Ms Helen Tomlinson [6941]	50059	Paper
6942	Mr & Mrs Wiesenberger [6942]	48643	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49687	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49689	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49696	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49681	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49695	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49677	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49682	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49693	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49684	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49685	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49686	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49679	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49676	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49675	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49673	Paper
6959	Mrs Lynn Hunt [6959]	49680	Paper
6976	Mrs Jane Bull [6976]	49247	Paper
6988	Mr Derek Cooknell [6988]	49244	Paper
6993	Rosalind Barber [6993]	48118	Email
6997	Mr Andrew Powling [6997]	48120	Email
6997	Mr Andrew Powling [6997]	48121	Email
7028	Mr Douglas Cox [7028]	49240	Paper
7033	Mr Samuel Newey [7033]	49233	Paper
7035	Mr Ryan Connolly [7035]	49014	Paper
7037	Ms Claire Wyatt [7037]	49117	Email
7043	Aoife Abbey [7043]	50379	Email
7043	Aoife Abbey [7043]	48198	Email
7048	Mr Jamie Waitkins [7048]	48947	Paper
7064	Mr JP Lindsay [7064]	48210	Email
7064	Mr JP Lindsay [7064]	48209	Email
7077	Richard and Helen Knee [7077]	48240	Email
7078	Dan and Claire Gambles [7078]	48241	Email
7081	Cliff Davies [7081]	48244	Email
7081	Cliff Davies [7081]	48245	Email
7098	Liz and Ian Jones [7098]	48273	Email
7098	Liz and Ian Jones [7098]	50378	Email
7106	Carly Wheatley [7106]	48302	Email
7106	Carly Wheatley [7106]	48301	Email
7109	Alfonso Pacitti [7109]	48312	Email
7109	Alfonso Pacitti [7109]	48313	Email
7119	Mr Rob Lane [7119]	48341	Email
7119	Mr Rob Lane [7119]	48340	Email

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 1: Sample

RES ID	RESPONDENT NAME	REP ID	SUBMISSION METHOD
7123	Hilary, Hannah and Hannah Phelvin and Geaney [7123]	48350	Email
7123	Hilary, Hannah and Hannah Phelvin and Geaney [7123]	48351	Email
7132	Mrs Margaret Demian [7132]	48373	Email
7132	Mrs Margaret Demian [7132]	48371	Email
7132	Mrs Margaret Demian [7132]	48372	Email
7133	James Lander [7133]	48376	Email
7134	Verity Thompson [7134]	48377	Email
7134	Verity Thompson [7134]	50494	Email
7151	Mr Terence Fitch [7151]	48405	Email
7156	Anna Trye [7156]	48415	Email
7156	Anna Trye [7156]	48416	Email
7175	Mr Alex Green [7175]	50228	Email
7175	Mr Alex Green [7175]	48471	Email
7194	Jane, Nigel, Phillipa & Tim Greasley [7194]	48546	Email
7198	Vicky Concannon [7198]	48557	Email
7201	Mr Peter Spiller [7201]	48575	Email
7201	Mr Peter Spiller [7201]	50377	Email
7212	Centro (Jonathan Haywood) [7212]	48613	Email
7212	Centro (Jonathan Haywood) [7212]	48612	Email
7212	Centro (Jonathan Haywood) [7212]	48614	Email
7212	Centro (Jonathan Haywood) [7212]	48615	Email
7214	Miss Jessica Crawford [7214]	48629	Email
7214	Miss Jessica Crawford [7214]	48628	Email
7214	Miss Jessica Crawford [7214]	48627	Email
7242	David Dimarco [7242]	48711	Email
7242	David Dimarco [7242]	48710	Email
7247	Mr. Guy Boulding [7247]	48746	Email
7247	Mr. Guy Boulding [7247]	48743	Email
7247	Mr. Guy Boulding [7247]	48745	Email
7247	Mr. Guy Boulding [7247]	48744	Email
7283	Dr & Ms Andrew & Mary Burke & Gunnell-Burke [7283]	48922	Email
7286	Mr J Molesworth [7286]	48925	Email
7292	Clive Stone [7292]	48946	Email
7315	Mr Robert Butler [7315]	49015	Email
7322	Carol Williams [7322]	49031	Email
7322	Carol Williams [7322]	49030	Email
7328	Mrs Glenys Hopkins [7328]	49064	Email
7350	Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	50293	Email
7350	Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	50299	Email
7350	Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	50298	Email
7350	Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	50296	Email
7350	Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	50294	Email
7350	Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	50295	Email
7350	Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	50292	Email
7350	Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	50291	Email
7350	Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	50297	Email
7413	Lyndsay Wager [7413]	49410	Email

**Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 1: Sample**

RES ID	RESPONDENT NAME	REP ID	SUBMISSION METHOD
7413	Lyndsay Wager [7413]	49411	Email
7426	Mitchell Johnson-Marshall (P J Mitchell) [7426]	50120	Email
7426	Mitchell Johnson-Marshall (P J Mitchell) [7426]	50121	Email
7426	Mitchell Johnson-Marshall (P J Mitchell) [7426]	50118	Email
7426	Mitchell Johnson-Marshall (P J Mitchell) [7426]	50124	Email
7426	Mitchell Johnson-Marshall (P J Mitchell) [7426]	50122	Email
7437	Mrs Alma Wheatley [7437]	50518	Paper
7490	Debby Hill [7490]	49897	Email
7490	Debby Hill [7490]	49898	Email
7505	Dee Cooper [7505]	50012	Email
7509	W and J Keeshan [7509]	50051	Email
7509	W and J Keeshan [7509]	50050	Email
7572	Sanjeev Kayshal [7572]	50576	Paper
7572	Sanjeev Kayshal [7572]	50629	Paper
7574	Satesh Kayshal [7574]	50630	Paper
7574	Satesh Kayshal [7574]	50578	Paper

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review

Appendix 2: Element Comments

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
Eleanor Baldwin [6328]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	50411	Green belt land at Old Milverton and Blackdown is valued by local community for recreation. Fulfills purposes of green belt as stated in NPPF. There are other sites which can be developed to south of Leamington (2009 Core Strategy). There are no exceptional circumstances. Understand need for housing and employment opportunities but on less destructive sites.	OMISSION & ELEMENT: (omission) suggests alternative sites to south have existing infrastructure and employment; (element) also refers to Blackdown	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50411&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
James & Ann Henly [6333]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	50416	Object to development in north Leamington. Violates conservation of green belt to detriment of community. Leamington and Kenilworth will lose identity of they merge. Roads, schools etc would further erode countryside and cost prohibitive. Reconsider for good of countryside and maintain quality of environment and its people.	ELEMENT: also refers to Blackdown	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50416&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Sue Mountford [6359]	A. Allocated Sites	47746	Object to Old Milverton and Blackdown sites. Loss of recreational land. Land fulfills purposes of green belt (NPPF). Other sites available to be developed, not in the green belt, to south of Leamington which were included in Core Strategy and where employment and infrastructure exists. No exceptional circumstances exist which outweigh the harm caused by altering boundaries.	ELEMENT: also refers to Blackdown	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47746&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Sue Mountford [6359]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	50444	Object to Old Milverton and Blackdown sites. Loss of recreational land. Land fulfills purposes of green belt (NPPF). Other sites available to be developed, not in the green belt, to south of Leamington which were included in Core Strategy and where employment and infrastructure exists. No exceptional circumstances exist which outweigh the harm caused by altering	ELEMENT: also refers to Blackdown	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50444&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 2: Element Comments

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
			boundaries.		
Helen Edwards [6509]	16. Green Belt	49904	Objects to development in the Green Belt when there are other alternatives available. The Plan is not considered to be in alignment with the NPPF and is therefore at odds with the 5 purposes of the Greenbelt. The proposal will reduce the 'green- lung' between Leamington and Kenilworth and will ultimately cause the merger of these two settlements and the loss of their identities.	ELEMENT: also refers to PO4 A allocated sites - N of Milverton and Blackdown	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49904&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mrs Kathleen M Greenwood [6595]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	50479	Object to green belt development in Old Milverton and Blackdown. Cannot see reason for cross country road plus all services. Loss of recreational land. Risk of merging with Kenilworth. Valuable farming land. Are all houses needed? Spoiling delightful part of the country.	ELEMENT: also refers to Blackdown	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50479&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mrs Kathleen M Greenwood [6595]	A. Allocated Sites	48003	Object to green belt development in Old Milverton and Blackdown. Cannot see reason for cross country road plus all services. Loss of recreational land. Risk of merging with Kenilworth. Valuable farming land. Are all houses needed? Spoiling delightful part of the country.	ELEMENT: also refers to N of Milverton and Blackdown	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48003&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Verity Thompson [7134]	A. Allocated Sites	48377	Greenbelt land should be protected from development. Greenbelt may only be altered under "exceptional circumstances". However, alternative sites for new housing exist in Leamington Spa and there are therefore no exceptional circumstances. Many of these sites are brownfield, benefitting from existing infrastructure.	OMISSION & ELEMENT: (omission) refers to N relief road - objection to PO14?; (element) also refers to Blackdown;	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48377&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review

Appendix 2: Element Comments

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
			<p>Land has great amenity and recreational value. Development will contribute to urban sprawl, reducing green space between Leamington and Kenilworth.</p> <p>This development will also have detrimental impact on character of Old Milverton, one of the last surviving villages around Leamington. The proposed northern relief road may also encourage further infill development in future.</p>		
Vicky Concannon [7198]	PO3: Broad Location of Growth	48557	<p>Strongly objects to the development of greenbelt land between Kenilworth and Leamington. This land is designated as greenbelt to protect urban sprawl, encourage urban regeneration, stop Kenilworth and Leamington from merging into each other and protect the countryside setting of historic towns and cities.</p>	ELEMENT: supports PO1, the fact that the district must grow but does not support the locations of growth PO3, and is specific about PO4 - between Leamington and Kenilworth	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48557&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Miss Jessica Crawford [7214]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	48627	<p>Exceptional circumstances for building in the green belt have not been justified</p> <p>There are more appropriate sites (eg North Leam School, Thwaites, south the town) which are either brownfield or where better infrastructure is in place.</p> <p>This area provides a valued gap between Leamington and Kenilworth.</p> <p>The proposals would add to congestion which would not be mitigated by the proposals</p> <p>This areas is rich in wildlife and provides an important local amenity and recreational area</p> <p>The proposals would destroy the character of Leamington as a Town</p>	ELEMENT: also refers to Blackdown	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48627&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr J Molesworth [7286]	PO4: Distribution of Sites for Housing	48925	<p>Dismayed that much of the development is towards the north of Leamington away from business parks and not so easy to commute to if you live in Coventry or Birmingham.</p> <p>Development should be near to employment opportunities and these lie to the south of</p>	OMISSION & ELEMENT: (omission) Major business located in the south arguing for affordable housing to be located close to employment; (element)	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48925&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review

Appendix 2: Element Comments

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
			Leamington Spa.	supports affordable housing PO5	
Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	Thickthorn	50293	A number of sites need to be identified to ensure deliverability of housing in the Kenilworth area, not just one - particularly as the Thickthorn site is under multiple ownership and may present challenges in delivery. The Thickthorn site would also require the replacement of existing uses and may have access problems. Allocating additional sites, in particular K25, would mean existing sports pitches at Thickthorn could be retained. It is also important to provide a variety of sites to provide choice and diversity.	ELEMENT: rep refers to PO4 generally but is only against Thickthorn	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50293&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
D Lawrie [142]	Preferred Option: High Speed 2 Rail Line	48347	There is no need for HS2	OMISSION: Environmental Impact of HS2; Concern over lack of consideration of HS2 through the local plan process	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48347&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Opus Land Ltd [178]	Relevant Issue & Strategic Objectives	48225	The wording of the preferred options is too restrictive in relation to change of use from Class B (Employment Uses). Specifically, the NPPF states that employment land should not be protected where there is no reasonable prospect of it being used for that purpose. The current wording of the employment section therefore does not have sufficient regard to market signals and whether land could be better used for a different form of development	OMISSION & NOTE: (omission) specific reference to paras 8.14 and 8.36; (note) assume element is PO8	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48225&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr and Mrs Kane [242]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	48421	We object to the proposed development in Old Milverton which has great recreational value and is protected greenbelt - it prevents unrestricted sprawl, safeguards the countryside from encroachment, stops the merger of settlements, preserves the special setting and character of Leamington and helps recycle derelict and other land.	OMISSION: Site has wildlife and agricultural value; Leamington historic town (emphasis); alternative sites (from 2009 CS); employment opportunities and infrastructure already exists here, and land should be used in preference to the Greenbelt	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48421&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr and Mrs Kane [242]	Blackdown	48423	We object to the proposed development in Blackdown which has great recreational value and is protected greenbelt - it prevents unrestricted sprawl, safeguards the countryside from encroachment, stops the merger of settlements, preserves the special setting and character of Leamington and helps recycle derelict and other land. Alternative sites are available and so exceptional circumstances have not been justified	OMISSION: Site has wildlife and agricultural value; Leamington historic town (emphasis); alternative sites (from 2009 CS); employment opportunities and infrastructure already exists here, and land should be used in preference to the Greenbelt	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48423&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Richard LAW [330]	Blackdown	48435	NPPF states Green belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances. Not the case as there are suitable sites in South Leamington, identified in Core Strategy. Most of road network is in south of town and to now propose building a "northern relief road "at vast cost , simply adds to error ! The Green Belt in Old Milverton and Blackdown fulfils the 5	OMISSION: alternative sites are white Belt	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48435&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
			purposes of Greenbelt set out in NPPF. Reconsider PO with view to concentrating housing development in south of town.		
Mr Brian Lewis [740]	Bishop's Tachbrook	48660	The policy states that the Council will work with Parish Councils to define the boundaries of their villages and thus identify land suitable for development. We support this approach and recommend that some or all of the land outlined in red on the attached plan (reference 6806-100), being land adjoining the existing built up boundary of Bishop's Tachbrook, be included within the village envelope and allocated for residential development.	OMISSION: Housing provision for Bishop's Tachbrook should be increased.	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48660&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr David Jordan [1525]	Woodside Farm (South of Whitnash)	50534	Officials have said that it is inappropriate and unsuitable to build here. Will add to urban sprawl against government recommendation. Children cannot get into local schools. Too dangerous for children to walk to school. Journeys to work hampered by congestion. Loss of final green parts of Whitnash. Facilities and road network are on north of Leamington. Build on brownfield sites, use empty homes and use Harbury Lane playing fields.	OMISSION: N of Leamington has good access to facilities as well as easy access to the A46, Coventry and M40.	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50534&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	14. Transport	49530	Support new routes to ease pressure from new development but no increased capacity over canal and rail bridges. Need engineered solution. Already concerned about emergency vehicles in rush hour. Need response before plan is committed to. Harbury Lane widening/improvement. Residents have to cross for bus and path access. If widened, pelican crossing needed for elderly and wheelchair residents to cross safely in fast moving traffic.	OMISSION: proposals for widening and directional control of Europa Way and traffic lights at roundabouts	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49530&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	PO14: Transport	48767	The existing road system already struggles to cope with the volume of traffic. Warwick has only one bridge over the river and is unable to cope with significant increase in traffic.	OMISSION: general support for policy and request for more cycle routes.	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48767&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
La Salle Investments [5130]	2. Our Vision for the District	49378	Welcomes reference to supporting the rural economy in paragraph 2.5 however given the important role of the rural economy a separate bullet point should be provided confirming the Council's support for sustainable growth in rural areas. This should state: Promoting a strong rural economy by supporting the sustainable growth and expansion to all types of businesses and enterprises in the rural area.	OMISSION: NPPF, weight and context	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49378&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
Mr & Mrs Cutler [5535]	Location of employment land	49050	Object to the words 'committed to the identification of a site of regional importance' being used in paragraph 8.33 of the plan as this does not align with the stated ambitions of the Coventry and Warwickshire LEP (strategy documents). There is a conflict of interest in having this statement in the plan, as a board member of the LEP is also the landowner for land within the project and the developer behind the project.	OMISSION: this statement should not rule out or eliminate the use of multiple or existing sites	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49050&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Martin and Stephanie Atkin [5565]	Blackdown	48666	Objects to development in the greenbelt at North Milverton and Blackdown. There is no credible case for such a radical change in policy given that little has changed since the 2009 Core Strategy. There are more appropriate areas of brown and white land which could be made available for housing instead of greenbelt. For example the Former Fords foundry could be used for housing instead of for a supermarket. There are few opportunities for residents to access open countryside in North Leamington for jogging, cycling etc. The greenbelt in Old Milverton and Blackdown fulfils the five purposes of the greenbelt and building within it contradicts other Preferred Options set out by the Council.	OMISSION: contrary to councils sustainability policies in terms of sustainable location/transport. Wider regional role of green belt	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48666&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Jonathan Lander [5595]	Preferred Option: Provision of Transport infrastructure	48789	Object to the proposals to turn the A452 between Leamington and Kenilworth into a dual carriageway. The Northern Relief Road is also not required.	OMISSION: other transport issues not mentioned in summary: existing peak time issues; more houses will increase congestion; NRR will encourage more development, across flood plan affecting nature; A46 is satisfactory; could look at south of Leamington.	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48789&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Jonathan Lander [5595]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	48787	Object to proposed development at North Leamington because it contravenes each of the five purposes of the green belt: - It encourages urban sprawl and retail development - It reduces the "green lung" between Leamington and Kenilworth to less than 11/2 miles encouraging the merging of these two towns - It encourages encroachment the countryside - It will destroy the setting and the special characteristics of Kenilworth and Leamington each of which has great historic interest In addition, this area is of huge recreational and agricultural value and land to the south of Leamington is a better development option.	OMISSION: reference to joint green belt study findings.	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48787&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Jonathan	Blackdown	48788	Object to proposed development at North Leamington because it	OMISSION: conclusions of	http://warwickdc.idi-

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
Lander [5595]			<p>contravenes each of the five purposes of the green belt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - It encourages urban sprawl and retail development - It reduces the "green lung" between Leamington and Kenilworth to less than 11/2 miles encouraging the merging of these two towns - It encourages encroachment the countryside - It will destroy the setting and the special characteristics of Kenilworth and Leamington each of which has great historic interest <p>In addition, this area is of huge recreational / agricultural value and land to the south of Leamington is a better development option.</p>	green belt study or sites in 2009 CS.	consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48788&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
mrs susan morris [5677]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	48316	<p>1: Housing Requirement</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The new plan identifies the need for 6986 dwellings over the suggested period but indicates it will deliver 8360, an over provision of 19.6% <p>2 : Exceptional Circumstances for greenbelt development not met</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Because of the over-provision of housing the development in the greenbelt cannot be justified - Does not comply with national policy - The plan does not use 'lower value' greenbelt land first <p>3 : Inconsistency with NLP Objective</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Milveston shown as both medium and high value land - Environmental concerns with site 	OMISSION: landscape character, SHLAA findings including part of site in flood zone and water source protection zone.	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48316&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Keith Hillyard [5997]	Blackdown	48326	<p>The area is too congested already as many of the existing roads are already busy. This would be exaggerated by any further growth. The infrastructure north of Leamington would require large scale investment in order to sustain additional housing (schools, roads). This land has always been green belt and this has been maintained over the years, to stop the urban sprawl. Without it, Leamington may end up merging with Kenilworth. What about existing housing stock? Are all options being examined?</p>	OMISSION: congestion on A452 and traffic related air quality issue. Is proposed housing number justified given empty houses?	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48326&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Keith Hillyard [5997]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	48325	<p>The area is too congested already as many of the existing roads are already busy. This would be exaggerated by any further growth. The infrastructure north of Leamington would require large scale investment in order to sustain additional housing (schools, roads). This land has always been green belt and this has been maintained over the years, to stop the urban sprawl. Without it, Leamington may end up merging with Kenilworth. What about existing housing stock? Are all options being examined?</p>	OMISSION: congestion on A452 and traffic related air quality issue. Is proposed housing number justified given empty houses?	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48325&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr James	Blackdown	48323	Objects to the use of greenbelt land in North Leamington to build	OMISSION: Council's	http://warwickdc.idi-

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
Hosking [6120]			<p>over 2000 houses. The aim of greenbelt as set out in the NPPF is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. There is land available outside the green belt to the South of Leamington as identified in the previous Core Strategy, with existing infrastructure and employment opportunities. The Council has not demonstrated the very special circumstances to justify development in the greenbelt. The proposals ignore the green belt studys assessment of the area and that it fulfills the five purposes of the green belt set out in the NPPF. The 'green lung between Leamington and Kenilworth will be reduced to less than 1.5 miles, encouraging their merger and loss of independant identities. The land is enjoyed by many walkers, runners, riders, and cyclists providing access to the countryside close to the towns. Old Milverton is one of the last surviving villages close to Leamington that has not been absorbed into the greater conurbation. Turning the A452 between Leamington and Kenilworth into dual carriage way will not help traffic flows, building more homes will simply increase congestion. A "Northern Relief Road" (budgeted cost £28m) is not required. Traffic flows tend to be north to south rather than east to west. The road will serve no purpose other than to take new home owners quickly on to the A46 and to jobs and shopping opportunities away from our Towns. The relief road would create a natural barrier encouraging further development and would have to be built across the flood plain violating an important nature corridor. The road network south of Leamington could be upgraded at a far lower cost. Out of town retail will affect independant traders taking trade away from the towns. There will be a loss of a significant amount of high quality agricultural land in Blackdown and Old Milverton. There is no need to include this land if the Council removes the 1400 house buffer</p>	<p>statement about North being financially more attractive to developers</p>	<p>consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48323&docid=23&searchtype=Response#</p>
Mr James Hosking [6120]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	48321	<p>Objects to the use of greenbelt land in North Leamington to build over 2000 houses. The aim of greenbelt as set out in the NPPF is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. There is land available outside the green belt to the South of Leamington as identified in the previous Core Strategy, with existing infrastructure and employment opportunities. The Council has not demonstrated the very special circumstances to justify development in the greenbelt. The proposals ignore the green belt studys assessment of the area and that it fulfills the five purposes of the green belt set out in the NPPF. The 'green lung between Leamington and Kenilworth will be reduced to less than 1.5 miles, encouraging their</p>	<p>OMISSION: Council's statement about North being financially more attractive to developers</p>	<p>http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48321&docid=23&searchtype=Response#</p>

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
			<p>merger and loss of independant identities. The land is enjoyed by many walkers, runners, riders, and cyclists providing access to the countryside close to the towns. Old Milverton is one of the last surviving villages close to Leamington that has not been absorbed into the greater conurbation. Turning the A452 between Leamington and Kenilworth into dual carriage way will not help traffic flows, building more homes will simply increase congestion. A "Northern Relief Road" (budgeted cost £28m) is not required. Traffic flows tend to be north to south rather than east to west. The road will serve no purpose other than to take new home owners quickly on to the A46 and to jobs and shopping opportunities away from our Towns. The relief road would create a natural barrier encouraging further development and would have to be built across the flood plain violating an important nature corridor. The road network south of Leamington could be upgraded at a far lower cost. Out of town retail will affect independant traders taking trade away from the towns. There will be a loss of a significant amount of high quality agricultural land in Blackdown and Old Milverton. There is no need to include this land if the Council removes the 1400 house buffer</p>		
Mr & Mrs Stuart & Katherine Ungless [6394]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	48800	<p>Objects to development on greenbelt land to the north of Leamington at Old Milverton and Blackdown. Can see the need for new housing to help the economy grow but does not believe there are proven exceptional circumstances to permit the development of greenbelt land particularly as there are other suitable sites previously identified by WDC which require less spending on infrastructure.</p> <p>Would result in the loss of publicly accessible open space used as a valuable amenity area for walking, jogging etc important as part of acheiving healthy lifestyles. It also provides an important habitat for a range of wildlife. The NPPF outlines that the purpose of the greenbelt is to prevent urban sprawl however if these areas are developed it would lead to the merging of Leamington, Old Milverton, Hill Wootton and Kenilworth in the future which is even more likely if Kenilworth is to expand southwards. This coalescence would lead to the eventual loss of the individual towns and villages distinct identities. Infrastructure would be unable to cope and the proposed Northern Relief road would result in additional destruction of the countryside.</p>	OMISSION: refers to alternative sites off Europa Way and south of Bishops Tachbrook.	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48800&docid=23&searchtype=Response#
Mr & Mrs Stuart &	Blackdown	48801	<p>Objects to development on greenbelt land to the north of Leamington at Old Milverton and Blackdown. Can see the need for</p>	OMISSION: refers to alternative sites off Europa	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48801&docid=23&searchtype=Response#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
Katherine Ungless [6394]			<p>new housing to help the economy grow but does not believe there are proven exceptional circumstances to permit the development of greenbelt land particularly as there are other suitable sites previously identified by WDC which require less spending on infrastructure.</p> <p>Would result in the loss of publicly accessible open space used as a valuable amenity area for walking, jogging etc important as part of achieving healthy lifestyles. It also provides an important habitat for a range of wildlife. The NPPF outlines that the purpose of the greenbelt is to prevent urban sprawl however if these areas are developed it would lead to the merging of Leamington, Old Milverton, Hill Wootton and Kenilworth in the future which is even more likely if Kenilworth is to expand southwards. This coalescence would lead to the eventual loss of the individual towns and villages distinct identities. Infrastructure would be unable to cope and the proposed Northern Relief road would result in additional destruction of the countryside.</p>	Way and south of Bishops Tachbrook.	on=submitsearch&repid=48801&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Peter Robbins [6399]	PO3: Broad Location of Growth	50337	<p>There is a contingency in the Preferred Options to the tune of 1400 homes. Detailed investigation of the low numbers assumed for allocations on sites such as the fire station and other town centre sites indicate that there is also a further hidden contingency. The council appears to be building contingency upon contingency. May also have oversupply of land on non-greenbelt land previously supported as suitable for development. Take away this contingency or buffer and there is no need to include the green belt land at Milverton.</p> <p>The approach is a complete change in direction compared with the 2009 Core Strategy document. 'Sharing the pain' is not justification for departing from this and has arisen from pressure not to build South of Leamington. Traffic surveys have not been carried out and infrastructure investigation is being used to justify the plan rather than being the basis for it. There is no evidence to suggest a larger number of houses could not be delivered in South Leamington.</p>	OMISSION: alternative development location around Radford Semele. Better employment and infrastructure available to the south. If additional housing for Coventry and Gateway then should be adjacent to airport to allow sustainable transport.	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50337&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	PO14: Transport	50009	<p>Turning the A452 in to dual carriageway will not help ease congestion and will damage the northern approach to Leamington.</p> <p>Building 3000 houses north of Leamington will increase congestion. The LNRR is not required as traffic flows tend to be north to south rather east to west. It will also encourage development up to the road in the long run.</p> <p>Development should be concentrated to the south of Leamington</p>	OMISSION: LNRR being built across flood plain which will increase cost and detrimental effect on picturesque gateways to both Leamington and Kennilworth (utilises	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50009&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
			which would mean the LNRR is not required.	template response)	
Mrs Sandra Barnwell [6925]	Thickthorn	49657	<p>Green belt safeguarded land. Not clear why this is no longer viable. RSS makes no provision for changes to established green belt boundaries.</p> <p>Land serves all of green belt purposes.</p> <p>Established uses on edge of Kenilworth including sports facilities, loss of which would require moving to another site. yet this facility is currently well located for the town and is well used by clubs and schools.</p> <p>Access to countryside, nature conservation interest and agricultural use.</p> <p>No exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>Range of other sites available outside green belt. Could be identified to offer options.</p> <p>Thickthorn is a "main migratory route for bats between Thickthorn Wood and Bullimore Wood" according an ecologist.</p> <p>Rocky Lane is a natural cut off point for development due to waterways and ancient woodland.</p>	OMISSION: 2 reps on PO4 issues - one rep also refers to Rocky Lane as a cut off and relocation of Cricket Club	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49657&docid=23&searchtype=Response#
Ms Helen Tomlinson [6941]	Loes Farm (North of Woodloes)	50059	<p>Object to development at Loes Farm for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> -Proposals are inconsistent with the NPPF -it will lead to irreversible destruction of green belt -it will result in loss of valuable habitat (2008 HBA) and wildlife (butterflies, moths, bats) -hedgerows, ancient trees and birdlife will be destroyed -it is a highly valued historic landscape with ridge and furrow fields -the proposals breach the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside and 1997 Hedgerows Act. <p>-There are alternatives available on brownfield and non-green belt land</p> <p>-The area is known for flooding (SE corner)</p> <p>-It will impact on the rural approach to Warwick and will be highly visible</p> <p>-it will have an adverse impact on the Historic Garden at Guys Cliffe</p> <p>-It will lead to increased traffic congestion on roads that already cannot cope.</p> <p>-the additional traffic will undermine road safety (crossing Primrose Hill)</p> <p>-it will put pressure on existing infrastructure within the Woodloes estate (schools, hospital etc).</p>	OMISSION: refers to issue of housing need citing slow development on Portobello Way, standing idle for 2 years	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50059&docid=23&searchtype=Response#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
			-new housing should be located close to employment areas to reduce the need to travel and reduce carbon emissions. Loes Farm is not close to major employment centres. -the area is used for recreation (walking, cycling etc). Its loss would undermine the push for healthier lifestyles		
Aoife Abbey [7043]	Blackdown	50379	Strongly opposed to developm on Green Belt land to the North of Leamington Spa. Nothing has changed since the 2009 Core Strategy so there cannot be any justification for these fundamental changes now.	OMISSION: look at Brownfield land.	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50379&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
James Lander [7133]	16. Green Belt	48376	The greenbelt provides excellent farm land and recreation land. No justification for the "exceptional circumstances" seem to have been given. Why have no other options been given? Why have the options identified in the 2009 plan been subsequently ignored? What has changed? Has any consideration been given to costs of the "preferred plan"?	OMISSION: inconsistent comments made at Parish Council meeting by Council Reps	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48376&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr J Molesworth [7286]	PO4: Distribution of Sites for Housing	48925	Dismayed that much of the development is towards the north of Leamington away from business parks and not so easy to commute to if you live in Coventry or Birmingham. Development should be near to employment opportunities and these lie to the south of Leamington Spa.	OMISSION & ELEMENT: (omission) Major business located in the south arguing for affordable housing to be located close to employment; (element) supports affordable housing PO5	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48925&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	PO16: Green Belt	50294	In respect of greenbelt, clearly to accommodate the levels of growth required the boundaries will need to be altered. RPS contend that the Kenilworth settlement and green belt boundary should be altered to run along the southern boundary of Site K25. This will still provide a recognisable boundary and also provide long term protection to the extensive retained green belt gap.	OMISSION: conclusions to report submitted in support of inclusion of new site	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50294&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	PO1: Preferred Level of Growth	50291	Disagree with the level (10800 units) of growth as insufficient for the plan period. The 2008 ONS Household Projections estimates an increase of 17,000 households between 2008 and 2028, at a rate of 850 dwellings per year. The 2012 SHMA indicates a requirement of 698 dwellings per year to meet affordable housing needs of the District, in addition to market housing needs. Therefore the Council's proposed dwellings number is significantly below the predicted number of new homes required. The plan also needs to	OMISSION: recognition that people live in Warwick area and work outside (commute), such as Coventry and Birmingham, where there is underprovision of housing.	http://warwickdc.idi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50291&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
			take into consideration the significant projected under provision of homes in nearby areas (for example Birmingham) and the SHLAA which indicates a supply of 13,385 units on deliverable sites, excluding windfall.		
Mrs Margaret Clare [7441]	7. Housing	50533	There are social issues such as crime and whether affordable homes are actually affordable. The impact of national policy in terms of immigration must be considered as it has a bearing on local social issues. Who policy makers target for being considered for social housing also needs some thought. The infrastructure as it stands would struggle to cope with more housing as there are already pollution issues affecting existing housing.	OMISSION: Whitnash is at saturation point	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50533&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Sanjeev Kayshal [7572]	Woodside Farm (South of Whitnash)	50576	Elevation of site at highest point would cause blot of landscape approaching Whitnash. Access could mean removal of woodland and road widening on busy network. Steep incline would result in increased flooding at Tachbrook Road/Harbury Lane junction. Underground power cables make area unsuitable. Inspector previously rejected site. Why is it in phase 1? Local schools over extended and unsafe to extend further. No school at Warwick Gates. What will happen to catchment area? Traffic in Whitnash already congested and roads blocked at peak times. Will worsen. Police moved north of river - could return if development takes place. Emergency services all to north of town. Busy access points already. No indication as to whether vacant property taken into account. Virtually no green spaces left around Whitnash. Government recommends no urban sprawl. If developed, it should be reduced number at low level with remainder left as green space for residents.	OMISSION: lower level housing - land at higher contours could be left for greenspace, therefore reducing visual impact of development.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50576&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Satesh Kayshal [7574]	Woodside Farm (South of Whitnash)	50630	Elevation of site at highest point would cause blot of landscape approaching Whitnash. Access could mean removal of woodland and road widening on busy network.	OMISSION: lower level housing - land at higher contours could be left for greenspace, therefore reducing visual impact of	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50630&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 3: Omissions: Representation Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME & ID	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
			<p>Steep incline would result in increased flooding at Tachbrook Road/Harbury Lane junction. Underground power cables make area unsuitable. Inspector previously rejected site. Why is it in phase 1? Local schools over extended and unsafe to extend further. No school at Warwick Gates. What will happen to catchment area? Traffic in Whitnash already congested and roads blocked at peak times. Will worsen. Police moved north of river - could return if development takes place. Emergency services all to north of town. Busy access points already. No indication as to whether vacant property taken into account. Virtually no green spaces left around Whitnash. Government recommends no urban sprawl. If developed, it should be reduced number at low level with remainder left as green space for residents.</p>	<p>development.</p>	

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
178	Opus Land Ltd [178]	Relevant Issue & Strategic Objectives	48225	Email	The wording of the preferred options is too restrictive in relation to change of use from Class B (Employment Uses). Specifically, the NPPF states that employment land should not be protected where there is no reasonable prospect of it being used for that purpose. The current wording of the employment section therefore does not have sufficient regard to market signals and whether land could be better used for a different form of development	OMISSION & NOTE: (omission) specific reference to paras 8.14 and 8.36; (note) assume element is PO8	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48225&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	PO15: Green Infrastructure	47028	Web	I am very excited about Green Infrastructure. As a local ecologist and natural historian I can see a lot of potential in the district for improvement. I have attached two documents of some idea that may be considered.	NOTE: original text includes comprehensive report containing specific habitat creation proposals eg Wildlife, wildflower meadows, water vole re-introduction programme, extension of Kingfisher Pools/Myton Fields.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47028&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	Loes Farm (North of Woodloes)	46318	Web	I object: Due detrimental impact on: Environment/Ecology Social access to green rural spaces Road Infrastructure Education Aesthetics Historic Environment Use of Green Belt	NOTE: original text refers to 2008 Habitat Biodiversity Audit report. Aesthetics issue relates to approach to Warwick which is not adequately explained. Archaeology value not mentioned.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46318&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
237	Mr Mark Smith [237]	Issues	46259	Web	I support the addressing of flood risk. I see a lot of potential in creating new wildlife sites in this.	NOTE: assume element is PO18	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46259&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
363	Dave Smith [363]	PO16: Green Belt, A.	47225	Web	I object both in terms of the impact on the community, local wildlife and sustainable development, and the potential breaches of PPG2/ National Policy Planning Framework that would result from the adoption of the Local Plan that includes the removal of the above land from Green Belt designation.	NOTE: original text refers to previous LP Inquiry 1996, GB erosion N of Leamington, if approved will set precedent. Data entry for "change to plan" is not a suggested change.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47225&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
740	Mr Brian	TABLE 7.2	48653	Email	It is important that the full housing requirement	NOTE: Flexibility	http://warwickdc.jdi-

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
	Lewis [740]	Distribution of Housing			is met within the Plan period and we therefore support the inclusion of a flexibility allowance to ensure that this can happen. We consider that the overall figure for village development should be increased. We are concerned that the overall housing target for the District for the Plan period is below that which is required. Moreover we are concerned that the windfall allowance is excessive. In addition it is inevitable that some sites which are allocated will not be developed during the Plan period. The inclusion of a flexibility allowance is essential.	allowance could also be included under P01	consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48653&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
1887	Philip and Barbara Lennon [1887]	Within the Urban Areas	49520	Paper	Good use of inner urban sites. Puzzled however at Warwickshire College site - are they moving?	NOTE: assume element is PO4	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49520&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
4701	Mr Chris Langton [4701]	Justification for Preferred Option	47169	Web	This sort of number makes sense over that time period - inducements to first time buyers would help stimulate demand and help boost the economy as Australia have done so successfully. A bottom up approach (unlike the Spatial Strategy) makes more sense as then you only release new housing as it is needed	NOTE: assume element is PO1	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47169&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	A. Affordable Housing on Housing Development Sites	48770	Paper	Will the rents be subsidised? Commercial rents are not within the reach of many families and individuals.	NOTE: assume element is PO5-Affordable housing	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48770&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	PO16: Green Belt	48769	Paper	Protect Green Belt to avoid communities merging and provide open areas for recreation. Building on the edge of existing development outside the Green Belt areas should be preferred option.	NOTE: Duplicate	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48769&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	Location of employment land	48773	Paper	I object to proposing more employment land to the North of Leamington as this would be on precious Green Belt areas.	NOTE: assume element is PO8	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48773&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
4801	Peter and	PO3: Broad	49725	Paper	Whilst limited growth in villages is supported,	NOTE: Part of the rep also	http://warwickdc.jdi-

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
	Philippa Wilson [4801]	Location of Growth			the proposals to distribute growth across the District impacts on the Green Belt. The Green Belt should be protected to prevent coalescence and to provide open areas for recreation.	refers to PO16 not part of rep 48781	consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49725&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
4801	Peter and Philippa Wilson [4801]	South of Gallows Hill/ West of Europa Way, Warwick	48766	Paper	This excessively extends the boundaries of Warwick well beyond existing development 1600 houses in one location on two edges of the small historic market town is over development in the extreme.	NOTE: Duplicate	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48766&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5521	Mr Malcolm Glenn [5521]	Bishop's Tachbrook	47133	Web	An opportunity not only to reshape and develop the village to a degree, but one to grasp and evolve how this can be used to enhance the village - to see how the various land owners and developers might be able to help the Parish Council meet some of the desires and aspirations of the villagers as detailed in the 2010 Parish Survey	NOTE: assume element is PO4	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47133&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5521	Mr Malcolm Glenn [5521]	B. Category 1 and 2 Villages	47132	Web	The nominal figure of 100 new dwellings per village is assumed to be a guide since each village is unique in character. Some residents might think it unwelcome, but it could so easily be regarded as a wonderful opportunity to explore what benefits this could bring to the village. Questions should be asked of land owners, developers, architects and landscapers, how best to accommodate this within one or more sites - seek to determine what each of these professionals can do for the village rather than allow them to treat it as just another job of building a quantity of houses.	NOTE: assume element is PO4	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47132&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5620	Miss Ann Crawford [5620]	PO6: Mixed Communities & Wide Choice of Housing, D. Student Accommodation & Houses in Multiple Occupation	47135	Web	It reflects my dismay at the exploitation by developers of properties in South Leamington being bought up and converted in Student bedsits or HMOs. We cannot stand any more and as a community are at our wits end. It is affecting peoples' health and wellbeing and will ultimately result in this are being more like Warwick University Campus.	NOTE: original text refers to "saturation" impacts of Student accommodation and HMOs. Proposed change asks for specific urgent policy implementation	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47135&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
5627	Professor David Wilson [5627]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	50092	Paper	Objects to the development of north of Milverton and at Blackdown as it is considered that the Councils housing projections are flawed, being based on projections that relate to exceptional growth seen in the boom years. The Council has failed to justify the 'exceptional circumstances' necessary to build on green belt as required in the NPPF, particularly as there is land available south of Warwick and Leamington that is available (and not designated as green belt). The proposed allocation in the green belt will lead to coalescence with Old Milverton losing its own individual identity in the process. There is better infrastructure available south of Warwick and Leamington as opposed to north of Leamington where the relief road will require great expense and even more land-take.	NOTE: part of rep could go against PO1 re level of growth	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50092&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5644	Mr Paul Welsh [5644]	Loes Farm (North of Woodloes)	46446	Web	The traffic generated by the proposed estate will create significant queues and delay in the area together with a significant increase in injury accidents. The adjacent highway network does not have the capacity to accept the additional traffic.	NOTE: original text refers to detail relating to local highway conditions and constraints	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46446&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5735	Ms Rachel Pope [5735]	On the Edge of Warwick, Leamington Spa & Whitnash	46686	Web	I strongly object to the proposal to develop on the Blackdown and North of Milverton sites because it does not comply with the Government's National Planning Policy Framework for development in the Green Belt. The plan is unsound for numerous reasons, in particular because the council itself, in 2009, identified that there were alternatives to developing the Green Belt. So far it has failed to explain what exactly has changed in order to justify this significant about-turn.	NOTE: original text refers to impacts on nature, agricultural land, and gateway.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46686&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5735	Ms Rachel Pope [5735]	Justification for Preferred Option	46682	Web	The commentary in this section fails to justify the decision to specify 600 homes pa. It simply cites evidence which shows that the majority of local people believe this figure to be too high.	NOTE: assume element is PO1	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46682&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5735	Ms Rachel	Other Options	46684	Web	These options are all interesting possibilities but	NOTE: assume element is	http://warwickdc.jdi-

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
	Pope [5735]				this plan fails to present local residents (ie voters) with sufficient information about the pros and cons. In particular, there is no discussion at all about the third bullet point, because the paragraph which should have addressed it (7.19) instead offers further discussion about the first bullet ('focusing development outside the green belt').	PO3	consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46684&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5754	Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	46741	Web	The level of housing development and inclusion of East Milverton site is (i) excessive and beyond that required under WDC's own assessment of housing needs, (ii) not consistent with WDC's own stated LP objectives for distribution of growth and green infrastructure, (iii) not justified/supported by key documents within WDC's Evidence Base such as SHMA, SHLAA, JGBS, STAOR and (iv) not compliant with the UK Government's National Planning Policy Framework guidance. Proposed housing development should be reduced and East Milverton site removed. Where excess capacity retained for "flexibility", South-of-Harbury-Lane and Glasshouse-Lane/Crewe-Lane sites should replace East Milverton site and majority of Blackdown site.	NOTE: original text refers to landscape value and flood risk.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46741&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5754	Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	46782	Web	Proposed development of Milverton site is non-compliant against three aspects of the NPPF. (i) exceptional circumstances - not justified by WDC's own evidence base (ii) well defined boundary - does not exist on western edge and thus enables future coalescence with Old Milverton (iii) development of agriculture and land based business in rural areas - loss of Grade 2 agricultural land covering the site. Documents within WDC's evidence base (e.g. SHLAA, JGBS, ISA and STAOR) clearly demonstrate there are more suitable and less environmentally sensitive alternative sites on non-Green Belt and lesser valued Green Belt	NOTE: original text refers to potential impact on flooding and water resources	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46782&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
					not yet in the Local Plan.		
5754	Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	Justification for Preferred Option	46785	Web	In para 8.15 it indicates that the NPPF states that "In order to promote a strong rural economy planning policies should:....Promote the development and diversification of agricultural and land based rural businesses" However the proposed development of Green Belt land on the Milverton site would result in the loss of Grade 2 agricultural land which covers the vast majority of the site. Thus the proposal to develop it for business (and housing) which displaces existing farming land is non-compliant with the guidance of the NPPF quoted above i.e. the NPPF cannot be quoted as a justification for inclusion of Milverton.	NOTE: assume element is PO1	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46785&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	7. Housing	46855	Web	I believe that the estimate of housing need should be reconsidered in the light of more recent and accurate data.	NOTE: original text refers reduction in recent immigration trends	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46855&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	PO3: Broad Location of Growth	46867	Web	The principles of the NPPF have again been abandoned. The historic and environmental case for land north of Warwick is even stronger than it is for white field sites to the s and SE of the town.	NOTE: original text refers to support for limited infilling of villages.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46867&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	Relevant Issue & Strategic Objectives	46863	Web	Please review the projections for sustainable growth which are clearly unrealistic - both in macro-economic terms and in environmental terms.	NOTE: original text refers to specific paragraphs (7.5, 7.6) and NPPF core principle 2.23.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46863&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	Justification for Preferred Option for the Broad Location of Growth	46866	Web	The local plan should be much more representative of the core principles of the NPPF.	NOTE: original text refers to revisiting model (housing projections) and use of brownfield before green belt	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46866&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5848	Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	Loes Farm (North of Woodloes)	46871	Web	This site has both high biodiversity and significant landscape and historic features. Such considerations are given high priority in the NPPF which states that land of lower environmental value should be used ahead of land of higher environmental value.	NOTE: original text refers to elevated nature of site and impact on entrance to Warwick. Potential impact on Guy's Cliffe Park and garden, and flooding and highway issues.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46871&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
5898	Mrs Marcella Smith [5898]	Loes Farm (North of Woodloes)	47099	Web	It is a Green Belt area Traffic concerns It closes the gap between Warwick and Kenilworth	NOTE: original text refers to impact on setting of historical town, and rural character of Woodloes	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47099&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5898	Mrs Marcella Smith [5898]	Loes Farm (North of Woodloes)	47102	Web	The land is Green Belt Serious traffic concerns It will destroy the rural setting It closes the gap between Warwick and Kenilworth	NOTE: original text refers to impact on setting of historical town, and rural character of Woodloes. Same as 47099 but slightly different summary	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47102&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5898	Mrs Marcella Smith [5898]	Loes Farm (North of Woodloes)	47095	Web	It is Green Belt Traffic Concerns Closing the gap between Warwick and Kenilworth	NOTE: Duplicate	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47095&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5917	Sara Barsley [5917]	Woodside Farm (South of Whitnash)	46985	Web	A Government inspector found No to the development in the Regional Spatial Strategy. What has changed, why has it been included? No local access to emergency services, Ashford road is already a rat run, more development means increase in traffic and accidents will happen on the road.	NOTE: original text refers to visual impact and green space impact issues	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46985&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	12. Climate Change	47344	Web	The Leamington Society supports the assertion (para. 12.26) * The use of green space and vegetation, (such as street trees) to provide summer shading and allowing winter solar gain. More street trees and vegetation will not only satisfy national and global Climate Change requirements but will also enhance the realm of Warwick District, making it a more pleasant area for everyone who lives or works here, or visits the district.	NOTE: Duplicate	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47344&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	PO6: Mixed Communities & Wide Choice of Housing, D. Student Accommodation & Houses in Multiple	47339	Web	High densities of HMOs in certain Leamington wards indicate that a specific planning policy is needed to control this, for the sake of the local community.	NOTE: original text refers to specific ideas for policy limiting HMO's and requirement for car parking. Also raises query re some areas of Leamington already reaching saturation point	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47339&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
		Occupation					
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	PO17: Culture & Tourism	47347	Web	<p>The Leamington Society shares the concern at the lack of visitor attractions and the need to increase and enhance tourism. However we feel that the Council's policy is too narrow and limited in scope.</p> <p>It does not support "appropriate development of tourism and visitors accommodation" because it has no stated policy towards achieving many of the activities listed below, most of which are well established methods to attract visitors into the district, and particularly the town centres. The policy must spell out, in language easily understood by both residents and potential investors in the district, what can be done by us all, together with the incentives, in order to increase visitors and tourist income to our towns.</p>	NOTE: original text refers to specific policy suggestions in relation to tourism and visitor accommodation.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47347&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
5967	Leamington Society (Mrs Marianne Pitts) [5967]	PO10: Built Environment	47342	Web	<p>The Leamington Society supports the fourth bullet point of PO10 "Protect, enhance and link the natural environment through policies to encourage appropriate design of the built environment and set out a framework for subsequent more detailed design guidance to ensure physical access for all groups." Specifically we would encourage WDC to put in place procedures to limit and reduce street clutter (A boards, unnecessary roadside signs etc.). Likewise, WDC should have the power to force the owners of homes or buildings to remove vegetation obstructing footpaths.</p>	NOTE: detailed submission, not really a summary.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47342&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6083	Mr George Riches [6083]	Warwick District Green Infrastructure Delivery Assessment 2012	47307	Web	<p>I support the concept of a Park, North of Kenilworth. With the proviso that no car parking is provided (exception for disabled people). Paths in the area are currently being improved to allow cycle and pedestrian access from Kenilworth and Coventry, designation of the area as a park would make it easier to extend</p>	NOTE: assume element is PO15	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47307&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
					the network. The bio-diversity supported by the area's agricultural practices needs to be maintained and increased. It would provide a pleasant showcase of the sub-region to Warwick University's large population of sojourners and should create wider popular support for resisting attempts to build on the land.		
6106	Mr. Roy Drew [6106]	Justification for Preferred Option	47332	Web	It all comes down to the transport difficulties caused by the rivers. How can those of us south of the rivers feel safe when all of the emergency services are based north of the rivers, especially when you are proposing to put so many more houses to the south? Reductions in numbers of police and firemen, and the hospital's being at full stretch already, exacerbate the problems.	NOTE: assume element is PO1	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47332&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6145	Mr J C Clack [6145]	Blackdown	49457	Email	Green belt land designated to grow food and to prevent urban sprawl.Facing food shortages and this is Grade 2 agricultural land. Loss of habitats and therefore pollination of food and bio crops.Risk of increased flash flooding and severe water shortages.Road network at capacity at busy times. Additional housing would add to this and exacerbated by more housing at Thickthorn and lack of improvements at Stoneleigh.Population growth overestimated with les immigration due to low employment prospects, lower family incomes and insufficient drinking water.Unlikely to find partner to build houses.Heathcote area excluded where it is not as controversial as north Leamington. Infrastructure is already in place and traffic would have alternative routes into town.Not explored brown field sites or redevelopment - why not all housing on Ford Foundry site?	NOTE: also suggests utilising ex Peugeot factory at Ryton on Dunsmore, outside the area raising a potential duty to cooperate issue	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49457&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6145	Mr J C Clack [6145]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	49455	Email	Green belt land designated for growing food and limiting urban sprawl. Major food shortages looming but grade 2	NOTE: also suggests utilising ex Peugeot factory at Ryton on	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49455&do

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
					<p>agricultural land proposed for development. Threat to habitats and therefore pollination for food and bio crops. Development exacerbates flash flooding and water shortages. Green belt land allows natural drainage. Road network at capacity at busy times. Additional traffic at Thickthorn will add to that from north Leamington developments causing traffic to queue on A46. This will be exacerbated by lack of improvements at Stoneleigh. Population growth does not seem to sit with volume of housing with low density of households. Population growth likely to be stemmed with reduced immigration levels due to lower employment and insufficient drinking water. Unlikely to find partner to build houses. Hethcote area excluded where it is not as controversial as north Leamington. Infrastructure is already in place and traffic would have alternative routes into town. Not explored brown field sites or redevelopment - why not all housing on Ford Foundry site?</p>	Dunsmore, outside the area raising a potential duty to cooperate issue	cid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6328	Eleanor Baldwin [6328]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	50411	Email	<p>Green belt land at Old Milverton and Blackdown is valued by local community for recreation. Fulfills purposes of green belt as stated in NPPF. There are other sites which can be developed to south of Leamington (2009 Core Strategy). There are no exceptional circumstances. Understand need for housing and employment opportunities but on less destructive sites.</p>	NOTE & ELEMENT: (note) in suggesting alternative sites to the south also refers to existing infrastructure and employment opportunities; (element) also refers to Blackdown	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50411&do cid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6417	Warwickshire County Council (Tim Willis) [6417]	13. Inclusive, Safe and Healthy Communities	47836	Email	<p>NHS Continuing Health Care budgets are being used to fund services for an imported population rather than local residents. Still seeing those who cannot afford expensive care homes being moved away from their local communities. Extra Care Housing continues to struggle when</p>	NOTE: probably more appropriate to be included in Rep 47834 under PO6.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47836&do cid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
					reaching planning and enabling stages.		
6541	Amy Selby and Lee Hammond [6541]	PO3: Broad Location of Growth	47770	Email	Irresponsible to develop land of north of Leamington and all those who enjoy the area.	NOTE: refers to potential for alternative sites but doesn't say where.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47770&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6565	Mrs Diane Broadbent [6565]	PO3: Broad Location of Growth	49391	Paper	I object most strongly to housing being built on Green Belt land. Eventually at this rate all districts including Coventry will become one large area.	NOTE: rep against PO3 but was stated as PO4 and is also against development in the Green Belt PO16	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49391&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6580	Warwickshire Gardens Trust (Christine Hodgetts) [6580]	Map 2: Potentially Suitable Urban/Edge of Urban Sites	47888	Email	We are concerned at the inclusion of Map 2 in the full document, which appears to include land not shown in the preferred options Map 4. Does this mean that sites shown on this map could potentially be reconsidered as development options?	NOTE: not sure this is an objection - just a misunderstanding between the PO's and SHLAA sites??	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47888&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6775	Mrs Dorothy G. James [6775]	Norton Lindsey	49359	Paper	Object to the use of greenbelt sites as it sets a new precedent and if allowed would open up the opportunity for further development in the future. The village already has three developments and this is enough. The roads, health services, infrastructure and any cycle routes we have on Sundays would change the whole village concept. Do not meet with proposed Po4 options as it stands.	NOTE: rep also refers more broadly to category 2 villages and not just Norton Lindsey	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49359&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6857	Mrs Marianne Grantham [6857]	Loes Farm (North of Woodloes)	49273	Paper	Detrimental to: wildlife, traffic, population of Woodloes Park, environment, schools/doctors/work in area, value of housing. Overcrowding of Woodloes Park.	NOTE: respondent put against PO16 but only refers to Loes Farm	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49273&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6866	Anne Hastings [6866]	PO14: Transport	48034	Email	Objects to the idea of a cycle path running through Abbey fields mainly because of the danger to children playing in the area. Bikes have been banned in the past for good reason. I also think such a wide path will spoil the appearance of the Fields.	NOTE: includes local officer knowledge re issue of Abbey Fields	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48034&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
6997	Mr Andrew Powling [6997]	North of Milverton, Leamington Spa	48120	Email	Local amenity - the land proposed for development to the north of Leamington is an important amenity for exercise and recreation Green belt - Green belt land should not be	NOTE: rep has been put against a) Thickthorn and b) land N of Milverton but rep does not specify sites	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48120&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
					developed when other suitable land is available Overall level of housing provision - There appears to be over provision of housing Coalescence of urban areas - The development will lead to Leamington, Old Milverton and Kenilworth merging Infrastructure - The current infrastructure cannot support the new development, it would take considerable investment and additional land to provide this infrastructure	so could also include Blackdown. Also looks at overall level of growth – PO1.	
7134	Verity Thompson [7134]	A. Allocated Sites	48377	Email	Greenbelt land should be protected from development. Greenbelt may only be altered under "exceptional circumstances". However, alternative sites for new housing exist in Leamington Spa and there are therefore no exceptional circumstances. Many of these sites are brownfield, benefitting from existing infrastructure. Land has great amenity and recreational value. Development will contribute to urban sprawl, reducing green space between Leamington and Kenilworth. This development will also have detrimental impact on character of Old Milverton, one of the last surviving villages around Leamington. The proposed northern relief road may also encourage further infill development in future.	NOTE & ELEMENT: (note) reference to NRR could go against PO14; (element) also refers to Blackdown.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48377&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
7315	Mr Robert Butler [7315]	The Location of New Housing	49015	Email	The area should be protected for the future generations. Once lost it is gone forever. The uniqueness of place will be lost. Retaining character is important and the character of the town which has taken time to develop should not be given up lightly.	NOTE: rep does not refer to specific sites but does refer to land around Leamington and specifically north which assume could be sites at Blackdown and land N of Milverton	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49015&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
7426	Mitchell Johnson-Marshall (P J)	B. Category 1 and 2 Villages	50120	Email	This policy will allow for previously developed land within the category 1 & 2 villages to accommodate a total of 850 new houses. Has	NOTE: on scanned rep no reference to redesign of village envelopes	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50120&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
	Mitchell) [7426]				the local authority identified such sites to accommodate this proposal? If so, where do they exist on previously developed land? Suggest that market housing allocations are promoted within selected villages to ensure a healthy mix of houses to suit young families through to retirement couples.		cid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
7505	Dee Cooper [7505]	PO3: Broad Location of Growth	50012	Email	Opposed to the urban expansion in the green belt North of Leamington Spa. Apart from taking away business from the centre of Leamington Spa and Kenilworth, it would spoil the beauty of our countryside.	NOTE: refers to land north of Leamington which could include Blackdown and land N of Milverton and other sites	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50012&do cid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
7572	Sanjeev Kayshal [7572]	Woodside Farm (South of Whitnash)	50629	Paper	Elevation of site at highest point would cause blot of landscape approaching Whitnash. Access could mean removal of woodland and road widening on busy network. Steep incline would result in increased flooding at Tachbrook Road/Harbury Lane junction. Underground power cables make area unsuitable. Inspector previously rejected site. Why is it in phase 1? Local schools over extended and unsafe to extend further. No school at Warwick Gates. What will happen to catchment area? Traffic in Whitnash already congested and roads blocked at peak times. Will worsen. Police moved north of river - could return if development takes place. Emergency services all to north of town. Busy access points already. No indication as to whether vacant property taken into account. Virtually no green spaces left around Whitnash. Government recommends no urban sprawl. If developed, it should be reduced number at low level with remainder left as green space for residents.	NOTE: Duplicate	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50629&do cid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
7574	Satesh Kayshal	Woodside Farm (South of	50578	Paper	Elevation of site at highest point would cause blot of landscape approaching	NOTE: Duplicate	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50578&do cid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 4: Noted Comments

RES ID	NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP ID	METHOD	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
	[7574]	Whitnash)			Whitnash.Access could mean removal of woodland and road widening on busy network.Steep incline would result in increased flooding at Tachbrook Road/Harbury Lane junction.Underground power cables make area unsuitable.Inspector previously rejected site.Why is it in phase 1?Local schools over extended and unsafe to extend further. No school at Warwick Gates. What will happen to catchment area?Traffic in Whitnash already congested and roads blocked at peak times. Will worsen.Police moved north of river - could return if development takes place.Emergency services all to north of town. Busy access points already.No indication as to whether vacant property taken into account.Virtually no green spaces left around Whitnash.Government recommends no urban sprawl.If developed, it should be reduced number at low level with remainder left as green space for residents.		n=submitsearch&repid=50578&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
Mr and Mrs Kane [242]	Blackdown	We object to the proposed development in Blackdown which has great recreational value and is protected greenbelt - it prevents unrestricted sprawl, safeguards the countryside from encroachment, stops the merger of settlements, preserves the special setting and character of Leamington and helps recycle derelict and other land. Alternative sites are available and so exceptional circumstances have not been justified	OMISSION: historic towns and alternative site	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48423&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Martin and Stephanie Atkin [5565]	Blackdown	Objects to development in the greenbelt at North Milverton and Blackdown. There is no credible case for such a radical change in policy given that little has changed since the 2009 Core Strategy. There are more appropriate areas of brown and white land which could be made available for housing instead of greenbelt. For example the Former Fords foundry could be used for housing instead of for a supermarket. There are few opportunities for residents to access open countryside in North Leamington for jogging, cycling etc. The greenbelt in Old Milverton and Blackdown fulfils the five purposes of the greenbelt and building within it contradicts other Preferred Options set out by the Council.	OMISSION: contrary to councils sustainability policies in terms of sustainable location/transport. Wider regional role of green belt	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48666&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Liz and Ian Jones [7098]	Blackdown	Development in North Leamington will: reduced the open attractive countryside in the area, already under threat from HS2 and possible expansion of Coventry Airport. swallowing up of the green space separating Leamington from Kenilworth and subsequent loss of identity.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50378&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Mark Smith [237]	Loes	I object: Due detrimental impact on: Environment/Ecology Social access to green rural spaces Road Infrastructure Education Aesthetics Historic Environment	NOTE: original text refers to 2008 Habitat Biodiversity Audit report. Aesthetics issue relates to approach to Warwick which is not adequately explained. Archaeology value not mentioned.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46318&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
		Use of Green Belt		
Mrs Marcella Smith [5898]	Loes	It is a Green Belt area Traffic concerns It closes the gap between Warwick and Kenilworth	NOTE: original text refers to impact on setting of historical town , and rural character of Woodloes	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47099&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mrs Marcella Smith [5898]	Loes	The land is Green Belt Serious traffic concerns It will destroy the rural setting It closes the gap between Warwick and Kenilworth	NOTE: original text refers to impact on setting of historical town , and rural character of Woodloes. Same as 47099 but slightly different summary	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47102&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Paul Birdsall [6212]	Loes	Congestion. Access of Primrose Hill will add to existing congestion. Water pressure is always an issue and would need to be assured for new development. Contradicts PO18 unless significant improvements are made. Medieval ridge and furrow should be preserved as historic site. Extended access required for pedestrians and cyclists. PO16 re-empts PO4 in that one needs the other. PO16 excuses development wherever but claims to stop urban sprawl. 8000 houses will demand improvements in local infrastructure. PO2 hollow statement. If PO4 developments go ahead, investment in infrastructure should be mandatory for developers to provide or local community will have to face cost. Strongly object to 'developers are asked to contribute to costs' Demand it.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49427&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Amrik Gill [6446]	Loes	Objects to new homes planned for Loes Farm. Moved into a property backing onto the farm in order to enjoy a good family town life but also be close to the country. The land has old hedgerows and trees and is full of wildlife in its natural habitat. To destroy this and lose another Greenfield site, for which Woodloes still holds its values would be forever unfavourable. I am sure that the other sites are better suited and have had more recent	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47662&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
		developments built.		
Mrs Mary Walsh [6505]	Loes	Loss of land at Loes Farm means losing an area used for recreation. Warwick is a historic town and there has already been a lot of development there and in the surrounding areas. The increase in cars will lead to gridlock on the roads.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49467&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Ms Helen Tomlinson [6941]	Loes	Object to development at Loes Farm for the following reasons: -Proposals are inconsistent with the NPPF -it will lead to irreversible destruction of green belt -it will result in loss of valuable habitat (2008 HBA) and wildlife (butterflies, moths, bats -hedgerows, ancient trees and birdlife will be destroyed -it is a highly valued historic landscape with ridge and furrow fields -the proposals breach the 1981 Wildlife and Countryside and 1997 Hedgerows Act. -There are alternatives available on brownfield and non-green belt land -The area is known for flooding (SE corner) -It will impact on the rural approach to Warwick and will be highly visible -it will have an adverse impact on the Historic Garden at Guys Cliffe -It will lead to increased traffic congestion on roads that already cannot cope. -the additional traffic will undermine road safety (crossing Primrose Hill) -it will put pressure on existing infrastructure within the Woodloes estate (schools, hospital etc). -new housing should be located close to employment areas to reduce the need to travel and reduce carbon emissions. Loes Farm is not close to major employment centres. -the area is used for recreation (walking, cycling etc). Its loss would undermine the push for healthier lifestyles	OMISSION: refers to issue of housing need citing slow development on Portobello Way, standing idle for 2 years	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50059&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Douglas	Loes	Greenbelt land. Endangered species.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
Cox [7028]				consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49240&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Jamie Waitkins [7048]	Loes	Green Belt, protected species , ancient hedgerows and trees.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48947&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mrs Alma Wheatley [7437]	Loes	The proposed development will result in increased traffic particularly on Primrose Hill. The extra traffic at rush hour will make crossing the road very difficult. There have already been fatalities even before any proposed changes.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50518&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr G E Cooper [563]	Milverton	Land available south of Leamington identified in 2009 Core Strategy. therefore no special circumstances. Prevents merging of towns. Sensitive areas of high quality farmland. Recreational value. Would result in loss of Old Milverton as a village. Increased congestion. Making A452 dual carriageway would not help as bottlenecks would occur either end. Housing number buffer, if removed would obviate need for this land. Better infrastructure to south of Leamington. Once lost, green belt cannot be replaced. Destruction of valuable countryside.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49567&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	Milverton	The level of housing development and inclusion of East Milverton site is (i) excessive and beyond that required under WDC's own assessment of housing needs, (ii) not consistent with WDC's own stated LP objectives for distribution of growth and green infrastructure, (iii) not justified/supported by key documents within WDC's Evidence Base such as SHMA, SHLAA, JGBS, STAOR and (iv) not compliant with the UK Government's National Planning Policy Framework guidance. Proposed housing development should be reduced and East Milverton site removed. Where excess capacity retained for "flexibility", South-of-Harbury-Lane and	NOTE: original text refers to landscape value and flood risk.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46741&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
		Glasshouse-Lane/Crewe-Lane sites should replace East Milverton site and majority of Blackdown site.		
Mr Keith Hillyard [5997]	Milverton	<p>The area is too congested already as many of the existing roads are already busy. This would be exaggerated by any further growth.</p> <p>The infrastructure north of Leamington would require large scale investment in order to sustain additional housing (schools, roads).</p> <p>This land has always been green belt and this has been maintained over the years, to stop the urban sprawl. Without it, Leamington may end up merging with Kenilworth.</p> <p>What about existing housing stock? Are all options being examined?</p>	OMISSION: congestion on A452 and traffic related air quality issue. Is proposed housing number justified given empty houses?	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48325&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Hilary, Hannah and Hannah Phelvin and Geaney [7123]	Milverton	<p>Objects to development at Old Milverton and Blackdown. The Council has failed to demonstrate the 'exceptional circumstances' required in the national guidelines to permit development in this area of Green Belt. The area is beautiful and the footpaths provide the only access to the countryside within direct walking distance of North Leamington, used regularly by walkers and runners. The character of North Leamington and the unique beauty of the village of Old Milverton will be lost forever. The area provides a natural habitat for wildlife and an educational resource for children. Joining up Leamington and Kenilworth would erode the character of these towns.</p> <p>There are alternative sites to the south of Leamington, south of Heathcote towards Bishops Tachbrook. Infrastructure in North Leamington cannot support new development and the cost of providing it does not make economic sense whereas existing infrastructure is in place to the South.</p>	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48350&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Alex Green [7175]	Milverton	<p>The land north of Leamington is used heavily for recreation and is highly valued for its beauty.</p> <p>Green belt should be retained, nit built on especially as alternatives sites south of Leamington Spa are available</p>	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48471&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
		where infrastructure is better. Also the infrastructure requirements for the development will irrevocably damage Leamington and change its historic character . Road improvement (LNRR and dual carriageway are likely to lead to out of town stores and damage to the vitality of the Town Centre.		
Carol Williams [7322]	Milverton	The 2009 Core Strategy identified land other than the Green Belt which could be developed. This means there are no special circumstances for develop in the Green Belt. Developer profits should not be a factor in determining where development goes. Old Milverton and Blackdown have a recreational value to them. Old Milverton could be absorbed into Leamington if developement takes place. There would be increased demand on the road network and greater traffic congestion. Anorthen relief road is not required. There would be development on the flood plain, loss of agricultural land and the buffer of new homes must be removed from equation .	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=49030&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Landowners of SHLAA Site K25 [7350]	PO1	Disagree with the level (10800 units) of growth as insufficient for the plan period. The 2008 ONS Household Projections estimates an increase of 17,000 households between 2008 and 2028, at a rate of 850 dwellings per year. The 2012 SHMA indicates a requirement of 698 dwellings per year to meet affordable housing needs of the District, in addition to market housing needs. Therefore the Council's proposed dwellings number is significantly below the predicted number of new homes required. The plan also needs to take into consideration the significant projected under provision of homes in nearby areas (for example Birmingham) and the SHLAA which indicates a supply of 13,385 units on deliverable sites, excluding windfall.	OMISSION: recognition that people live in Warwick area and work outside (commute), such as Coventry and Birmingham, where there is underprovision of housing.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50291&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Brian Lewis [740]	PO3	The windfall allowance is excessively high and there is little evidence that it will deliver the number of dwellings	FURTHER RESPONSE: specifically asks for more	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48651&do

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
		anticipated during the Plan period. The windfall allowance should be substantially reduced. This is predominantly because rates of windfall development seen during the last decade are unlikely to be repeated in the years ahead	detailed justification of windfall allowance	cid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Brian Lewis [740]	PO3	We support the broad locations for growth, which directs the majority of development to the main urban areas but allows for some growth within and adjoining the edges of the more sustainable villages. We particularly support the identification of Bishops Tachbrook as suitable for housing allocations.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48658&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Brian Lewis [740]	PO3	It is important that the full housing requirement is met within the Plan period and we therefore support the inclusion of a flexibility allowance to ensure that this can happen. We consider that the overall figure for village development should be increased. We are concerned that the overall housing target for the District for the Plan period is below that which is required. Moreover we are concerned that the windfall allowance is excessive. In addition it is inevitable that some sites which are allocated will not be developed during the Plan period. The inclusion of a flexibility allowance is essential.	NOTE: Flexibility allowance could also be included under P01	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48653&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr Jonathan Lander [5595]	PO3	The council has added nearly 1400 homes to the number that it anticipates will be required so as to include a "buffer" in the forecasts. If this "buffer" is removed from the forecast there is no need to include the land at Old Milverton and Blackdown in the proposals. Insufficient account has also been taken of potential windfall sites in the forecasts. The model used to calculate the number of houses required appears flawed by using average data over recent years for demand rather than projecting on the basis of the current downward trends.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48790&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mrs Louise Wilks [5754]	PO3	The total housing development is 1400 greater than is indicated as required by Table 7.1. Given the implication	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46783&do

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
		of this is concentrated development in the Leamington Spa locality and in particular concentrated development of Green Belt to the North of Leamington Spa there needs to be strong evidence provided by WDC to justify this excess development given its impact on Green Belt. There is no such evidence in the Local Plan Preferred Options Consultation nor the accompanying Evidence Base.		cid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	PO3	Please review the projections for sustainable growth which are clearly unrealistic - both in macro-economic terms and in environmental terms.	NOTE: original text refers to specific paragraphs (7.5, 7.6) and NPPF core principle 2.23.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46873&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Dr Barry Meatyard [5848]	PO3	If there is a limited supply of land for development we should start to ask the question 'What does sustainability mean in the context of Warwick'. Clearly there are limits to growth, and as indicated above I am not convinced that the model used to calculate growth is a valid one. There are both theoretical and practical limits to growth, which if exceeded will fundamentally change the character of Warwick as a historic county town. It is in danger of becoming a castle surrounded by a housing estate.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46873&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Warwickshire Gardens Trust (Christine Hodgetts) [6580]	PO3	We are concerned at the inclusion of Map 2 in the full document, which appears to include land not shown in the preferred options Map 4. Does this mean that sites shown on this map could potentially be reconsidered as development options?	NOTE: not sure this is an objection - just a misunderstanding between the PO's and SHLAA sites??	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47888&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Rosalind Barber [6993]	PO3	It is felt that the exceptional circumstances to justify development of the green belt have not been put forward. There is a concern the unique character of Leamington and Kenilworth could be lost. The countryside should not be destroyed other sites exist with infrastructure in place to use. New houses should be of a type, size, quality and price to meet the needs of those who require housing	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48118&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr. Guy Boulding [7247]	PO3	A "buffer" of 1400 homes has been included in the number of houses Warwick District Council believes will be necessary between now and 2026. There is no need to include the land at Old Milverton and	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48746&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
		Blackdown in the proposals if this "buffer" is removed from the assumptions.		
Mitchell Johnson-Marshall (P J Mitchell) [7426]	PO3	The large allocations will attract large developers who can enact s.106 agreements which any future outline permission will require. The scale of these allocations will squeeze out any opportunities for local businesses or future school leavers, with large firms tendering the supply of goods and labour outside the area. Also the open space between the towns of Leamington and Kenilworth must be protected. It makes no sense to locate large housing sites in this area, when employment uses are primarily located towards the south of Leamington - causing traffic problems travelling north to south.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50118&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
D Lawrie [142]	PO14	There is no need for HS2	OMISSION: Environmental Impact of HS2; Concern over lack of consideration of HS2 through the local plan process	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=48347&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Louise Griew [5707]	PO14	I support a cycle way through Abbey Fields - why shouldn't cyclists be able to enjoy the fields too?	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46576&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Highways Agency (Neil Hansen) [6409]	PO14	Further modelling will be required if this PO is persuaded.	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=47962&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Mr David Jordan [1525]	Woodside	Officials have said that it is inappropriate and unsuitable to build here. Will add to urban sprawl against government recommendation. Children cannot get into local schools. Too dangerous for children to walk to school. Journeys to work hampered by congestion. Loss of final green parts of Whitnash. Facilities and road network are on north of Leamington. Build on brownfield sites, use empty homes and use Harbury Lane playing fields.	OMISSION: N of Leamington has good access to facilities as well as easy access to the A46, Coventry and M40.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50534&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
j jordan [5680]	Woodside	<p>Traffic is already a nightmare for everyone and more housing in this area will simply make matters worse. Congestion already at peak times. Increased risk of accidents especially at the Harbury Lane and Tachbrook Rd junction Destruction of habitats and green space in area already hit by over development. Lack of school places for local children. Greater pressures on local police force when they are already stretched. Nothing has changed since the last government inspectors ruling so why is this being considered again? Massive housing development already (Warwick Gates), area should not be subjected to more!</p>	SATISFACTORY	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46508&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Sara Barsley [5917]	Woodside	<p>A Government inspector found No to the development in the Regional Spacial Strategy. What has changed, why has it been included? No local access to emergency services, Ashford road is already a rat run, more development means increase in traffic and accidents will happen on the road.</p>	NOTE: original text refers to visual impact and green space impact issues	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=46985&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#
Sanjeev Kayshal [7572]	Woodside	<p>Elevation of site at highest point would cause blot of landscape approaching Whitnash. Access could mean removal of woodland and road widening on busy network.</p> <p>Steep incline would result in increased flooding at Tachbrook Road/Harbury Lane junction. Underground power cables make area unsuitable. Inspector previously rejected site. Why is it in phase 1? Local schools over extended and unsafe to extend further. No school at Warwick Gates. What will happen to catchment area? Traffic in Whitnash already congested and roads blocked at peak times. Will worsen. Police moved north of river - could return if</p>	OMISSION: lower level housing - land at higher contours could be left for greenspace, therefore reducing visual impact of development.	http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50629&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review
Appendix 5: Omissions from Meta-Summaries

RESPONDENT NAME	ELEMENT TITLE	REP SUMMARY	ENVISION COMMENTS	REP URL
		<p>development takes place. Emergency services all to north of town. Busy access points already. No indication as to whether vacant property taken into account. Virtually no green spaces left around Whitnash. Government recommends no urban sprawl. If developed, it should be reduced number at low level with remainder left as green space for residents.</p>		
Satesh Kayshal [7574]	Woodside	<p>Elevation of site at highest point would cause blot of landscape approaching Whitnash. Access could mean removal of woodland and road widening on busy network. Steep incline would result in increased flooding at Tachbrook Road/Harbury Lane junction. Underground power cables make area unsuitable. Inspector previously rejected site. Why is it in phase 1? Local schools over extended and unsafe to extend further. No school at Warwick Gates. What will happen to catchment area? Traffic in Whitnash already congested and roads blocked at peak times. Will worsen. Police moved north of river - could return if development takes place. Emergency services all to north of town. Busy access points already. No indication as to whether vacant property taken into account. Virtually no green spaces left around Whitnash. Government recommends no urban sprawl. If developed, it should be reduced number at low level with remainder left as green space for residents.</p>	<p>OMISSION: lower level housing - land at higher contours could be left for greenspace, therefore reducing visual impact of development.</p>	<p>http://warwickdc.jdi-consult.net/ldf/viewreps.php?action=submitsearch&repid=50630&docid=23&searchtype=Respondent#</p>

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review

Appendix 6: Summary of Missing Comments (meta-summaries)

PO1

- recognition that people live in Warwick area and work outside (commute), such as Coventry and Birmingham, where there is underprovision of housing.

PO3

- specifically asks for more detailed justification of windfall allowance
- We particularly support the identification of Bishops Tachbrook as suitable for housing allocations.
- It is important that the full housing requirement is met within the Plan period
- we are concerned that the windfall allowance is excessive.
- The council has added nearly 1400 homes to the number that it anticipates will be required so as to include a "buffer" in the forecasts. If this "buffer" is removed from the forecast there is no need to include the land at Old Milverton and Blackdown in the proposals.
- The total housing development is 1400 greater than is indicated as required by Table 7.1.
- Please review the projections for sustainable growth which are clearly unrealistic - both in macro-economic terms and in environmental terms.
- I am not convinced that the model used to calculate growth is a valid one.
- We are concerned at the inclusion of Map 2 in the full document, which appears to include land not shown in the preferred options Map 4.
- New houses should be of a type, size, quality and price to meet the needs of those who require housing
- The large allocations will attract large developers who can enact s.106 agreements which any future outline permission will require. The scale of these allocations will squeeze out any opportunities for local businesses or future school leavers, with large firms tendering the supply of goods and labour outside the area.

PO14

- Environmental Impact of HS2; Concern over lack of consideration of HS2 through the local plan process
- I support a cycle way through Abbey Fields
- Further modelling will be required if this PO is pursued.

Blackdown

- Greenbelt preserves the special setting and character of Leamington
- Wider regional role of green belt
- swallowing up of the green space separating Leamington from Kenilworth and subsequent loss of identity.

Loes

- Archaeology value not mentioned.
- It closes the gap between Warwick and Kenilworth
- impact on setting of historical town
- Medieval ridge and furrow should be preserved as historic site.
- The land has old hedgerows and trees and is full of wildlife in its natural habitat.
- Loss of land at Loes Farm means losing an area used for recreation.
- refers to issue of housing need citing slow development on Portobello Way, standing idle for 2 years
- The area is known for flooding (SE corner)
- the area is used for recreation (walking, cycling etc).
- Endangered and protected species.

Warwick District Council Local Plan Preferred Options - Consultation Process Review Appendix 6: Summary of Missing Comments (meta-summaries)

- The proposed development will result in increased traffic particularly on Primrose Hill.

Milverton

- Housing number buffer, if removed would obviate need for this land.
- not justified/supported by key documents within WDC's Evidence Base such as SHMA, SHLAA, JGBS, STAOR
- What about existing housing stock? Are all options being examined?
- Joining up Leamington and Kenilworth would erode the character of these towns.
- the infrastructure requirements for the development will irrevocably damage Leamington and change its historic character.

Woodside

- Too dangerous for children to walk to school.
- Greater pressures on local police force when they are already stretched.
- Ashford road is already a rat run
- Police moved north of river - could return if development takes place.
- lower level housing - land at higher contours could be left for greenspace, therefore reducing visual impact of development.