

## **Matter 7d Written Statement – H53 Brownley Green Lane – Merion Morgan (14156 / 5051)**

**H53.**

**Matters 1-7.**

**Further Comments/Objections .**

**Matter 2 and 3.**

Housing numbers/Coventry overspill. No real explanation for where the increase in proposed housing numbers has come from (data source?) – appears to be promoted by Developers looking to acquire and develop Greenfield sites in areas of high property value to maximise profits and totally unacceptable given the already high over-development in the district.

Site H53 lies within the Green Belt Boundary – this should only be changed in *exceptional circumstances*. I strongly consider that this condition has not been met for this site. I understand that a Housing Needs Survey for the parish of Hatton (which includes Hatton Park) was completed in 2014. A very comprehensive survey, which highlighted the need for 12 dwellings. This indicates that the development of H53 for a proposed 55 homes is not needed – not sustainable and certainly not demonstrating exceptional circumstances for removing the land from the Green Belt.

The draft Local Plan does not provide an explanation of the sudden need to increase housing need allocations and makes no real reference to the other sites that may have been considered and discounted. The basis for the additional sites is not adequately reasoned based on a blip in the data and there is a massive question as to the need to release land from the Green Belt to accommodate unnecessary supply of land allocated for residential development.

Does the current policy adequately ensure that it both prioritises the re-use of brownfield sites in urban areas and restricts development on competing greenfield sites? The government published guidance in 2014, which reaffirms how Councils should use their Local Plan, drawing on protections in the National Planning Policy Framework, to safeguard their local area against urban sprawl – these should only be altered in exceptional cases.

**Matter 4.**

To designate Hatton Park a “growth village” now is severely flawed and not consistent with the earlier Planning views. I am deeply concerned that this is considered appropriate when the existing Brownfield site development was originally agreed on the basis that the housing volume designated was the maximum that the area could sustain – see response under Matter 7d (infrastructure and facilities issues).

**Matter 5.**

H53 is not a realistically deliverable site – no evidence has been provided as to why it should be such. See response under Matter 7d (infrastructure and facilities issues).

## **Matter 6.**

H53 is located within/adjacent to the Green Belt and will remove the spectacular views to open countryside that Hatton Park is known for. Adjacent to the site are areas specifically identified as wildlife corridors and areas to support a diverse ecosystem (designated as such already by Warwick DC Green Space Team). These should not be compromised.

To develop H53 would encroach on greenbelt which has not been used before ie existing development is purely brownsite – this would open the gates to develop agriculture land between Hatton Park and the Beausale village area, not touched before and not in any previous Plan iteration.

## **Matter 7d.**

- a. Access to **H53** is proposed through Barcheston Drive, within the existing Estate (not Brownley Green Lane as currently badged). This is not feasible in any way. Far too narrow for heavy construction traffic volume with traffic calming features to protect pedestrians including schoolchildren.
- b. Access to Barcheston Drive from the site would be very steep – I would be surprised that Highways would agree to this bearing in mind the very close proximity to the Village Hall, children's play area and Ball Park (the only amenities for the whole estate). So close, they would need to cut through the existing Village Hall car park. Highly dangerous to residents/children using these facilities. The location of what would be a busy junction (during the building and after completion stages) is totally inappropriate. This area is owned by the Resident's Association and we would not be willing to sell any of this land for such a purpose.
- c. Infrastructure Issues. The Birmingham Road is a major trunk route, extremely heavily congested at peak times and very busy at other times. Construction traffic and in due course the number of additional cars flowing in/out of the Estate will escalate the problem considerably. With no school, college, medical or other facilities on the Estate all residents have to drive to other locations. There have already been fatalities and serious road accidents – increased traffic volumes will escalate the issues. Proposals for further substantial new housing at the local village of Hampton Magna as well simply add to the infrastructure pressures eg the school, Doctors's surgery located there and narrow country lanes leading thereto.
- d. What are the "special circumstances" to justify this incursion on new Green Belt/agriculture land? Is the driver promotion by a Property Developer? Environmentally unsound. Heavy existing use of resident's cars as no schools,

medical centre, shops or good public transport on site. No necessary infrastructure identified in the Local Plan to mitigate these issues - just add more houses!

- e. H53 is a highly visible site impacting a large number of existing houses on the north west of the Estate – 2 to 3 years of construction noise would be high impact and blight the values and saleability of a high number of properties. New houses would have a massive impact on existing properties. This Green Belt site was not considered before in the Local Plan iterations, so clearly not a preferred site. Overall number of new houses now proposed at Hatton Park unnecessarily high for a Parkland development and disproportionate with the very limited facilities on the Estate.
- f. A Government Spokesman said in December 2015 that “planning reforms mean that local people decide where developments should or should not go”. There has been no consultation here with a last minute change being made to the Local Plan, no opportunity for local people to fully debate the options available and the soundness of what is proposed.

#### Other points.

a) Have any sites closer to rail links such as the highly popular Warwick Parkway Station been considered? Consideration given to reduce traffic flows by using sites where pedestrian traffic can access rail, school facilities?

Sites omitted from the Local Plan. Oaklands Farm was considered before but now deleted. Whilst use of the site for housing does not help the Birmingham Road traffic volume issues, it is directly accessible to this Road and does not endanger the existing residents/pedestrians on Hatton Park and the not inconsiderable access implications of H53.

Latest news indicates that there are thousands of properties unoccupied in many large conurbations – has this issue been addressed to assist in solving the shortage of housing problem?

28/08/2016