

**Matter 7A Written Statement – H44 North of Milverton – Brian Taylor (13847)**

Dear Sir,

I write to reinforce my objections, previously registered, to the use of green belt land to the north of Leamington Spa, for the development of overspill housing for Coventry's needs.

There are many reasons for this release of green belt being inappropriate, and indeed wrong, and I will endeavour to outline a few of the principal ones that concern me.

The land in question is high grade arable land in regular production, and forms part of the green lung between the towns of Leamington and Kenilworth. It also allows the hamlet of Old Milverton to retain its distinctive character, which would be destroyed if extensive development were to be allowed as proposed.

The green belt land in question is of a higher graded value than potential sites nearer to Coventry, and indeed Coventry's own local plan identifies the need for housing near to the current boundaries, to minimise commuting in to the city. The land at north Leamington singularly fails to meet this criteria. The land in question is some 9 miles from the centre of Coventry, and is not well-supported with public transport infrastructure. No adequate plan exists to improve public transport so, even if the homes were to be bought by people employed in Coventry, their only way to work would be to use their private cars, adding to congestion and pollution levels in an already congested road system to the north of Leamington. Furthermore, as can already be seen at the development at Semele Park, just outside Radford Semele, the type of property that would be built does not address the need for affordable, relatively high density housing that is within the economic reach of many young families seeking to buy their first home at a location from which they can easily commute to their place of work, in Coventry. The properties that would be built in north Leamington's green belt, will I am certain be high-margin 'executive' homes, well beyond the economic reach of young families with employment in Coventry. The argument that developers will put forward that each new property will create a chain to allow a new buyer to move into a first house is at best specious, and is used purely to justify the developers wish to build high margin properties for the benefit of their own bottom line and their shareholders' profits, rather than to address the need for appropriate housing for our communities. The more appropriate route would be to release lower-graded green belt land, closer to Coventry, with planning permission granted only for higher-density development immediately providing entry-level housing for more people, than would any high-margin 'executive' development in north Leamington.

The land to the north of Leamington is also a highly valued and much-used social amenity for the residents of the town, which is rich in wildlife. Every day

the well-maintained public paths are used by walkers, dog-walkers, cyclists, runners, riders and those with specific interests, including local schools. The area supports much bird-life and in 2016 I have personally seen kestrels, wood-peckers, finches and many other bird-types, while walking in the area, including for the first time recently, a red kite.

The infrastructure of north Leamington is also inadequate for the creation of a further 1250 homes, each of which would almost certainly be occupied by multi-car families, creating excessive congestion in north Leamington. In short, Warwick D C has spent much time and resource trying to justify the release of green belt land and can only justify the exceptional circumstances required by claiming the development will be appropriate for absorbing the housing needs of Coventry. This argument, as I believe unsustainable in every aspect, and no exceptional circumstances therefore exist.

There are more appropriate sites, closer to the point of need, for the provision of housing for the people of Coventry.

Some of the land in question is also to be set aside for the future needs of housing in Leamington. Again, the destruction of green belt land is neither appropriate or sustainable in this case, for many of the same reasons. This proposal should not be allowed to progress.

Please record my strong objection to this inappropriate and misguided proposal.

Yours faithfully,

Brian Taylor