**GAYDON PARISH COUNCIL**

***Clerk to the Council*:** Corinne Hill, Gaydon Fields Farm, Gaydon, Warwickshire CV35 0HF

01926 641220

email: parishclerk86@btinternet.com

**February 2016**

**Gaydon Parish Council (GPC) Response to Revised SPD (Nov 2015)**

# General

The Parish Council feels that the tone of the document is more akin to a marketing pitch, than a reasoned planning assessment: filled with aspiration but not tackling fundamental difficulties with the whole proposal.

Gaydon Parish Council has met and carefully considered each part of this SPD and offers the following comments:

References to SPD paragraphs

# Introduction

**Section 1.1 Background**

Whilst employment and business should be catered for in the Core Strategy (CS), Stratford on Avon District Council (SDC) is unwise to focus the majority of its housing allocation on one particular area of business; especially one focused on a small and precarious market sector; i.e. the luxury car market.

Recent history has shown the ebb and flow of the fortunes of Jaguar and Landrover. To build a settlement based on the fortunes of one or two employers in the same market is unwise. One only has to look at the examples of the coal and textile industries.

The CS should encourage a diverse range of businesses in an area where there is already an established source of human resource or at least an area that has adequate transport infrastructure between established housing and workplace.

*“JLR requires sufficient and appropriately located land”...”to attract and retain a highly skilled workforce.”*

As can be seen from the amount of traffic entering and leaving the JLR site at peak times, the majority of employees do not reside locally. The above statement shows a lack of understanding of the type of workforce employed at JLR Gaydon and JLR’s policy toward its workforce. Most engineering staff are employed on a contract basis. These contract engineers have no allegiance to JLR and ‘follow the money’ as the industry rates fluctuate between manufacturers. The permanent staff are encouraged to improve themselves. Promotion, or simple re-allocation, can lead to jobs in any of the JLR plants, in the West Midlands and beyond.

Current Planning applications for the JLR site show a ‘2020 Masterplan’; this shows use of recently acquired land to the south but makes no reference to the ‘employment land’ east of the B4100: that included in the GLH allocation.

SDC should be distributing its housing and employment developments evenly over the district to encourage new business into the area and encourage reduced traffic movement by siting employment next to existing settlements.

**1.2 The purpose of the SPD**

The SPD is premature. The CS has not been 100% adopted: GLH being the part that has not been adopted. Therefore it is not reasonable that the SPD should be read in conjunction with a document that is not fully adopted.

This document does not have the tone of an information/consultation document. It is heavily biased and promotes the development in the tone of a sales document. Information is incomplete and misleading and makes fantastical presumptions on both employment and population movement.

Figs. 2 and 3 are out of date, omitting a significant feature of the development site boundary; the new Gaydon bypass. This cuts off the southeast corner of the site and reduces the size of the allocation.

# The Site and its Context

**2.1 Location**

Without the words “Strategic location” paragraph 2.1 is a justification in its self as to why a settlement should not be built here. GLH is far from any major commercial centres and is part of the ‘Green gateway’ to Warwickshire.

Reference is made to the site being a ‘village’. When combined with the surrounding villages it will be a ‘town’! Yet a town with village sized facilities, infrastructure and access: one way in, one way out.The Atkins Report of October 2012 for Warwickshire County Council Highways Department is not acknowledged**.** Section 4.9 in this report stated that JLR and Aston Martin are not in the most sustainable locations, as evidenced by congestion issues caused by the reliance on the private car.

**2.3** **Local facilities**

Health

No mention is made of Dental facilities.

Education

It is important to note that Kineton School is 5 miles away from GLH housing. This is too far for children to walk to school. In the absence of a cycle path cycling along the Kineton/Southam road must be considered as dangerous. This only leaves the road transport option for resident’s children. This will only add to the already congested traffic around Gaydon. If this site was truly sustainable it would have its own secondary school, as was originally envisaged. GPC has long argued for the benefits of on-site secondary provision and might also suggest that this would be a good opportunity for JLR for sponsor a secondary engineering academy.

Leisure and recreation

*‘More extensive leisure facilities (including cinemas, theatres and indoor/outdoor recreation facilities) are located in Royal Leamington Spa, Stratford-upon-Avon and Banbury.’* This means that residents will require a car outside the hours of bus services

**2.4 Existing Gaydon Site – Core Strategy Policy AS11**

**Current JLR operations at Gaydon**

This document goes to great length to say how many people work for JLR even stating how many jobs will be created at its Wolverhampton site. What it doesn’t say is how many currently work at the Gaydon site or how many jobs they expect to create at Gaydon over the life of the CS.

*“ ....There is a direct relationship with Warwick district where many JLR employees live..”*

This document omits to point out that these employees commute from Warwick/Leamington and the surrounding area; mostly by car down the B4100 – the proposed main road through GLH.

With the amount of development currently taking place to the south of Warwick/ Leamington Spa, it will be more attractive for future home owners to live there; where they have schools, a train station, safe cycle routes and better shopping facilities.

*“JLR needs to adapt quickly to external forces....changes in demand...”*

These changes can include a drop off in demand. This tends to mean laying off staff. In such a scenario any GLH resident employees will have to travel outside the area to find work; most likely by car: leaving GLH to the fate of the mining towns.

**Current AML Operations**

Should AMLs fortunes improve to a point they can further expand, there is no room for them to expand to the west of the B4100. Development space or parking provision will be required on the ‘GLH site’.

Recent news speaks of AML’s purchase of a large facility in South Wales. It would not be unreasonable to expect AML to move all of their production to this facility in the near future as the Gaydon facility is currently leased from JLR with whom they are competitors.

**Avon Valley Indoor Bowls Club**

GPC would welcome the inclusion of new facilities for AVIBC within GLH; if that is the club’s desired location.

**2.5 Planning Policy Context**

**The Development Plan**

“The councils Core Strategy process has confirmed that the allocation of the site is appropriate”

This is simply not true. The CS process has been found wanting by the government inspector and the appropriateness of the site is so much in question that the CS cannot be fully adopted.

The site is clearly not appropriate as there is only one access road and no provision for a future bypass. The site is remote from commercial centres and large supermarkets. Resident’s fortunes and those of the service sector within GLH will be dependent on one industry.

**Core Strategy**

Why is there provision for 3000 houses, when only 2300 are required to meet the needs of the CS as planned for in Section 6?

Why is the employment land needed by JLR when they have submitted application 16/00288/FUL which gives them extra land that is not considered within the CS?

# Site Constraints & Opportunities

**3.1 Topography and Views**

The majority of the proposed site slopes towards the motorway. This will create an eyesore for existing settlements to the south and east around Burton Dasset and Edge hill which, even with the addition of a vegetation screen around the periphery, will be a blight upon the landscape. This will only be exacerbated by the presence of the proposed ‘bund’ to protect residents from the noise of the motorway. It goes without saying that an enormous manmade earthwork is not only incongruous with the visual character of south Warwickshire, but will also greatly limit residents’ views out of the site, thereby giving the development an enclosed and claustrophobic atmosphere.

From a drainage point of view, as the site slopes towards the south it is reasonable to expect that surface runoff of rainwater onto southerly land will increase as development progresses. Given the areas’ existing problems with flooding, GPC questions the capacity of the planned mitigation measures. Where does the water eventually flow to?

**3.2 Landscape Character**

Given that the identified plots will be paved over and turned into a housing estate, it is hard to identify exactly what existing character can be retained. Given the proposed development of high density housing including blocks of flats, GPC can only surmise that there will be a detrimental impact on existing settlements and the visual character of the landscape.

The zone analysis is useful and gives an indication on why certain areas are considered either suitable or unsuitable for development. It doesn’t however appear to recognise the new road in zone 8 with its controversial cross road junction.

**3.3 Soil, Ground Conditions and Contamination**

50 hectares (18%) of the site is classified as Grade 3a agricultural land. This section of land falls almost completely into Zone 7 identified in the previous section as having a high capacity to accommodate development. GPC question why the best farmland is reserved for industrial development.

**3.4 Access and Movement**

Traffic remains a key concern and the document doesn’t have sufficient content or any indication of measures to be taken. GPC believe that the following actions need to be carried out before plans progress any further:

* A new impartial and holistic Strategic Traffic Assessment (STA) based on worst case scenarios needs to be carried out in light of the new enhanced Junction 12 arrangements that takes into account the new houses, the details of the industrial developments, the knowledge that secondary school traffic will have to cross the flow of JLR traffic, and concerns over the impact of any M40 closures. It needs to be acknowledged that even the current road improvements are designed to reduce current queues – not actually eliminate them.
* There is far too much reliance on a single motorway junction: the B4100, the Southam to Kineton road (B4451) and other local roads will not be fit for purpose. Traffic calming will most certainly not be required at peak times. The SPD glosses over the projects Achilles Heel.

For some reason, there appears to be a problem of outright denial of any traffic congestion problems on the B4100. If this issue is not taken seriously and addressed, this development will end up bringing traffic flow on one of the main arterial routes through south Warwickshire to a standstill at peak hours.

Connectivity to larger established centres (Banbury, Stratford, Warwick and Leamington) is not fully addressed by providing a few buses: buses are already comparatively expensive and infrequent and will need their own bus lanes if they are not going to just add to the queues.

Connectivity to established local centres is addressed but is a relatively minor detail.

**3.5 Historic Environment**

The site goes too far, transforming a previously rural setting with well-masked industrial facets into something resembling an urban commuter town. There is no commitment to retain fragments of historic links to RAF Gaydon.

**3.6 Ecology**

It is acknowledged that further surveys will be required. GPC would like to suggest that native wild flower reseeding will assist the net gain in biodiversity that is expected.

**3.7 Flood Risk and Drainage**

As mentioned in the response to section 3.1, the SPD does not provide any solutions (hypothetical or concrete) to the question of flooding of surrounding communities beyond the statement that ‘care will need to be taken’, although it has been noted that on-site flood prevention measures have been proposed. GPC would ask that the proposed Flood Risk Assessment looks very carefully at the impact of any surface runoff on the lands to the south.

**3.8 Utilities**

It is hard to comment without access to a more specific and detailed plan detailing exactly how services are to be provided. However, it is imperative that additional strain is not put on existing utility infrastructure (as it will be on the road networks) that forces the surrounding settlements to bear the burdens of the new one.

**3.9 Noise**

The proximity of the site to both the M40 and B4100 raises questions about its suitability for human habitation. The main proposed method of alleviating the noise problem (the bund) is extremely heavy-handed and will be an eyesore that will be able to be seen from miles around. It is never going to be a peaceful, quiet, rural setting in which to reside. As promoted in section 4.

**3.10 Air Quality**

Given the site’s proximity to the M40, It is never going to be the healthiest of locations, especially when the wind comes from the North and East. There is little point in promoting an environmentally friendly ‘Green development’ when the location is between a busy main road and a Motorway.

**3.11 Constraints**

The proposed development will use all of the available space on the Eastern side of the B4100. This leaves little to no leeway for constructing additional features/infrastructure in the future if it is so needed (e.g. a secondary school). Another issue is the lack of alternative routes in and out of the settlement – the vast majority of people will have to use the B4100 as their primary point of egress and ingress due to the M40 preventing any exits being constructed along the entire eastern edge of the site.

**3.12 Opportunities**

The identified ‘opportunities’ seem to be operating on assumptions rather than concrete plans for delivery. The SPD shows the new settlement as having a village centre that can be shared with Lighthorne Heath residents, but gives them no way to cross the B4100 at peak hours. Fig 18 within the SPD appears to be anticipating major Eastward expansion of Jaguar Land Rover. This seem that any meaningful connections via foot or cycle path are between the residential areas and this zone only and do not serve adequately the main centre of employment. Even at this stage, GPC notes that this land is not currently owned by JLR.

1. **Vision and Principles**

What an amazing piece of marketing!! Most of these “visions” are without substance: no mention of how and when the infrastructure will be delivered. The vision of connectivity especially raises an eyebrow: surely someone has no idea of what is actually meant by this! Without concrete assurances being given, all mention of green space and community cohesion are, at best, conjecture.

Before any development can move forward, it would be imperative that any and all promises are set in stone, lest we end up with a development that offers no sustainability both for physical quality of life for residents and social cohesion. GPC lacks confidence in these “visions” being realised.

# Illustrative Masterplan

**5.1 Concept Master plan**

The potential landmark is not welcomed by GPC within the land allocated for JLR. GPC questions how relevant land allocation is now that JLR has made unwelcomed substantial land purchases to the South and West of their current site.

GPC would like to see SDC strongly encourage JLR to make use of this 100ha of land first by not permitting development of land to the south that currently separates Gaydon from JLR and the wider proposed developments associated with GLH.

The opening comments of this section seem out of date and simply a rehash of the previous document that has been commented on in November 2014. The proposed dual carriageway for example: not constructed for GLH (and yet proposed as if it is) is of course nearing completion.

Does JLR share the ambition of including a leisure/event facility on its land?

**5.2 Master plan Principles**

Comments on each point:

**(1) JLR** - Generally supported.

**(2) Eco Reserve** - GPC shares past Lighthorne concerns for this but offers no other comments.

**(3) Set back from ancient woodland** - Seen as vital but not seen as being sufficiently included in any of the plans submitted so far.

**(4) Landscaped bank** - Seen as vital if housing is to go ahead.

**(5) Open space between the duelled road and Gaydon** – This is welcomed but our County Cllr Chris Williams has already indicated that this is to be returned to the landowner and has therefore already closed the door to any locally endorsed ambitions for this land.

**(6) Use of existing green infrastructure** – Sounds good. GPC points out though that previous planning applications have seemingly disregarded any elements that don’t quite fit into their own proposals. Such infrastructure was gloriously described as ‘scrub’ before proposing its removal.

**(7) SUDS** – GPC supports such measures if development was to go ahead; however there is a question over the route water will take when leaving the SuDs

**(8) Kingston Grange Farm** – No comment.

**(9) Village centre** – Not ambitious enough for a sustainable community that does not rely on travel to other larger centres for most services.

**(10) Residential Neighbourhoods** – GLH is not a suitable site for such numbers of housing as has been argued on the grounds of a lack of existing or sustainable connectivity coupled with the lack of facilities.

**(11) Gateway Feature** – The last lot of plans talked simply of a pub. Being a rural settlement, a more ‘low key’ approach would be more appropriate.

**(12) Public Rights of Way** - There are very little that actually connects GLH to places. Such that is proposed appears to be the rerouting of the limited paths that are already in place.

**(13) Redundant roadways** – Sounds good but who is locally endorsing these as both the previous and current PC views have been either disregarded or appear to be viewed with irritation.

**(14) Traffic calming of the B4100** – GPC’s position remains consistent: an already heavily, peak time, congested, motorway relief road is being traffic calmed without any alternative route being provided.

All GLH generated traffic including that from the 100ha of employment land is all directed onto the same road.

GPC has, right from the start, argued that what is proposed, is simply not a viable or sustainable solution and that Traffic Assessments have consistently underestimated the impact and volume of traffic generation.

* An additional crossing of the M40 and suggestions for bypasses have been proposed as a way forward and so far ignored.
* GPC also suggests that more should be made of the M40 crossing on the Old Gated Rd with a route to join the Fosse way (taking traffic away from Chesterton as it would be adjacent to the motorway) to alleviate to pressure and reliance on the B4100. This is not GPCs preferred option but is an alternative.

Without some alternative route being embraced by SDC, WCC and the developers, this is not a suitable site for such large scale housing developments.

Proposals within this SPD again seem to suggest that there are no peak time issues associated with an ever expanding JLR facility.

**(15) New access points to JLR** – More proposals, a rehash of those already under construction or ones additional to being built? This is not clear.

**(16) Tree lined Avenues** – The GLH road network proposals do not address concerns already made clear in this or other previous submissions: tree lined or otherwise.

**(17) Bus stops** – These proposals seem to disadvantage many current Lighthorne Heath residents.

As the use of the bus seems to be the biggest of the mitigating elements of the Travel Plan it seems that buses (no matter how many stops) will rely on a good flow of traffic. It also relies totally on private companies wanting to provide services in the medium to long term.

As there are no dedicated bus lanes envisaged in this SPD, any alternative routes to alleviate peak time traffic or any guarantee of long term bus services this section appears to be little more than a set of aspirations. Any services that are seen to be slow, expensive and infrequent are unlikely to have any significant impact on minimising the expansion of traffic on the already congested and limited network.

**5.3 Movement and Access**

Aspirations of limiting car use need to be matched by a location of housing that is seen as convenient to where people want to go to if they are to have any chance of being realised: they are otherwise just warm words that look good in the marketing business. GLH is simply not well connected to Stratford, Warwick, Leamington or Banbury: even by road.

**Vehicular Access:** In the absence of acting on any of the suggestions given in good faith, GLH is not a workable or desirable location for large scale housing development.

**Public transport:** There is nothing on how the aims and aspirations are to be delivered, about their frequency and about how they will be sustained in the medium to long term. There is no mention about how they might be made attractive by using an express service that utilises dedicated lanes.

There is no detail in how the school traffic will be mitigated for or how it will not add to the peak time traffic that already exists. If secondary provision was part of GLH it wouldn’t need to be mitigated for and would add to social cohesion as has been argued for in the past.

GPC argues that the lack of detail to mitigate is symptomatic of the lack of joined up vision and planning. This shouldn’t be a problem if it had been planned as part of a SDC led CS and not one from developers.

**Travel plan:** JLR is proud of how their Travel plan is working as shared in the Liaison Meeting Jan 2016 but it is clear that it has needed a remodelling of the motorway junction, entry points and a duelled carriageway to have any chance of making a real difference to the current peak time congestion that Gaydon has become infamous for.

This Travel Plan as outlined in this SPD aims to reduce the growth of GLH generated traffic by:

* *Reducing the need to travel*: minimal facilities including those related to education mean that this will remain no more than an aspiration and fuzzy words.
* *Providing real alternatives to the car:* other than a promise of a few buses to add to the congested roads, GPC doesn’t recognise any alternative provision that is envisaged in this SPD.
* *Making alternatives to shared car use to be more attractive:* How? Tax incentives might make a difference but there are no mechanisms in the long term that SDC has to deliver this.
* *Managing car park provision:* by limiting car parking, car parking problems will become a feature of the new development. Such initiatives would only work if there really were real alternatives to the use of the private car. Light railways, trams and (at the very minimum) an express, cheap, frequent bus service. The one modelled by Oxford park n ride does make a big difference.

The Travel Plan seems to assume that most will work on site if the numbers that are expected to walk and cycle are to be believed. This is not realistic in the view of GPC because:

* There are few low skilled jobs on offer within this development.
* Highly skilled jobs on offer at JLR are often associated with more than just the site at Gaydon
* There is a lack of variety of jobs that come with this development as opposed to those in the original plans.

The links to nearby villages are all very academic as the villages offer few employment, retail or leisure opportunities to warrant significant travel whilst they are too far away for most to make use of the limited facilities on offer by anything else than by a car.

The whole paragraph about the tiny percentage that do cycle to work and how they may benefit from upgrades sums it up well.

**A safer route to schools**: another visionary statement not backed up with any details.

**The street hierarchy/Spine Rd/Cycle path/Foot paths**: No comment other than that the Spine road does need to connect to an alternative to the B4100 at least to one end.

**Accommodating the car & parking**: Again, no comment: accept to say that the lighting of any facilities should embrace technologies to reduce the impact on the wider environment.

**Traffic calming**: Whilst it is good to see that traffic calming is being taken seriously within the body of GLH, it must still be recognised that the B4100 is still a motorway relief road and the main route to employees of AML and JLR for the many who cannot access via the motorway due to where they reside.

GPC notes that 20mph zones are to be included within the village centre and residential areas. This should be extended to all surrounding villages if wished for by existing residents and Parish Councils (but is currently resisted by our county councillor who has made it clear that any such move would need extensive research and justification.)

**5.4 Character Areas**

The Central green Spine concept to connect areas is welcomed if GLH was to go ahead. It does however note that applications (these have been commented on) have amounted to no more than a few trees being planted alongside roads.

GPC urges the SPD to ensure maximum protection of the ancient woodlands: not just from building but also of pedestrians and their pets that will inevitable negatively impact the wildlife and soils in these sites.

**Village Centre**: The placement of a primary school (with the inevitable associated traffic that comes with them) so close to the village centre is problematic. Either additional road widening and parking will be needed or the retail parking will need to be located in the immediate area.

GPC is not clear whether nursery provision is to be included as part of the crèche or the primary school but does point out that facilities will be required early on in the development of this site (especially with regard to delivering the governments stated aim of 30 hours per week for each child.)

GPC notes that the provision of services amounts to little more than a local centre and is not sufficient to create a sustainable community that doesn’t rely on the use of the private car and is contrary to the ambitions of the Travel Plan. It is noted that health provision seems very limited (GPs, clinics, dental and optical), no provision for worship, little for retail other than for basic goods and precious little in regard to leisure.

Though not necessarily a feature of a village centre but should a cemetery also be included somewhere in the development?

GPC suggests that the community orchard that does sound pleasant needs to close to those who might most appreciate it: close to the elderly care housing?

The swale is potentially a pleasant feature but is the placement of the school/nursery/crèche so close to it such a wise idea in today’s health and safety conscious world?

**Lakeside**: the SPD suggests a very tall, very visible development zone that conveniently seems to have hidden the traffic as part of the concept. It also looks to be a zone that will require high and expensive maintenance and therefore is unlikely to be economically sustainable. Already there seems to be a mismatch between the concept of green walls and rooves and the artist’s impression. (A green wall amounts to rather more than a few pot plants on a balcony.)

**Green Spine**: In theory, this could be attractive but previously submitted plans have been far less ambitious than those described in this document (as already commented on). Even many city councils (e.g. Plymouth) struggle to maintain such high maintenance and costly projects.

**Village Core**: This high density housing reinforces the fear that it will amount to little more than an area dominated by cars being parked in between saplings.

**Woodland Rise**: No comment.

**Park Edge**: This housing is clearly aimed for the higher end of the market and will have the benefit of frontages that overlook and are dominated by traffic queuing along the B4100 on their way to secondary school, AML, JLR or the M40 towards other centres of employment. Though this may not fit into the sales or marketing pitch of the SPD, it is probably a most realistic assessment of what will be the reality.

**5.5 Jaguar Land Rover**

This section is suitably woolly and non- committal but the concept is generally supported by GPC if it protects land North and West of Gaydon from being changed from agricultural use by JLR.

Unfortunately, the reality is that the maps are already out of date and unwelcome plans are already being proposed for land that is not identified in this SPD north of the village of Gaydon.

GPC maintains that any JLR development in the identified zones (100ha or otherwise) should commit to minimised impact in terms of lighting, visibility, air pollution and sound pollution.

It is noted and welcomed that sustainable drainage systems (SUDS) are being included.

**5.8 Community Infrastructure:**

‘There is a clear requirement to fully address the community infrastructure needs of young people.’

This is a welcome statement and reason enough for GPC to argue that a secondary school is included. Other facilities appear limited to a bit of sport. Though it is accepted by GPC that WCC cannot open a new school, it would be a good opportunity for them to encourage JLR to open up a prestigious engineering academy on their site that fosters a real social and educational benefit to a new community: good for JLR, good for promoting government aims and good for a newly establishing community identity.

GPC wishes to restate that there are few other facilities on offer to cement a community and reduce reliability on the car to access those in already established centres: a breadth of leisure facilities, retail, provision for policing and governance and provision for worship or even death. How many towns don’t even have a cemetery?

**5.9 Social Housing**:

Whilst it is recognised by GPC that 35% of dwellings are to be of an affordable nature, it must equally be recognised that there needs to be adequate employment opportunities for those that live in them. Employment provision will need to match their profile of those that will be attracted to live in them or be encouraged to move to them. A breadth and number of job opportunities seem to be sadly lacking whilst relying almost completely on JLR. It cannot be argued that a single school, limited retail facilities and provision for the care of older people will generate enough employment on site. This will lead to yet more generation of traffic during peak times.

If a younger profile or resident is likely to be attracted to such housing or indeed other provision, this will need to be fully reflected in services that will be required and the additional traffic that will need to be mitigated against. It is unlikely that a new population will be reflective of more established centres.

**5.10 Housing Mix**:

GPC recognises that there does need to be a good mix of styles and sizes of housing will desirable and needed if GLH was to go ahead: however, GPC is not clear of what is meant by*: ‘ The potential role of the private sector rental in Gaydon/Lighthorne Heath should also be explored.’*

Is it envisaged that existing residents are expected to become developers and landlords?

# Delivery

**6.1 Delivery Objectives**

The Masterplan states that all elements of community should be considered comprehensively in order to promote an integrated approach. Sadly GPC don’t feel this has been the case. GPC maintain our view that the whole process is back to front, with a masterplan already in formal draft prior to the Government Inspector’s final decision on whether GLH is a sound proposition. How can a Masterplan be implemented without a finalised Core Strategy?

‘*There will be a co-ordinated approach to delivery of the new settlement and expansion of JLR’*: GPC point out that the land as allocated to JLR does not currently appear to be owned by them and so the smooth delivery as outlined is already impossible to plan for: this very presumptuous.

*‘There will be clarity concerning the infrastructure to be delivered’* and that *‘delivery will be co-ordinated’*: the necessary infrastructure delivery, in accordance with each phase, does not have clear timescales. Within the aims, there is no mention on the impact of construction logistics on the existing network and communities over the 15 years that this document covers: only that disruption should be minimal. GPC fail to see how the delivery of such a large scale development over the next 20 or so years will not disrupt all neighbouring communities and the operations of JLR/AML. The plan is thin on detail and paints over the potential impact on the area.

GPC notes that the SPD states that future management and governance ‘will be established prior to first occupation’ which is planned for 2017.

**6.2 Delivery Mechanisms**

GPC note that the SPD recommends that *‘the* *cumulative impact of the wider development will need to be taken into account’* and therefore urge that our thoughts and recommendations be taken into account, particularly in relation phasing of transport, education, health be included and implemented. GPC further urges that the lack of clarity over timescales for the necessary infrastructure and its implementation is addressed to ensure this plan is sound.

In relation to the paragraph relating to the land for JLR’s expansion, GPC also note that the ‘detailed site wide masterplan on the JLR component of the GLH site’ again seems almost out of date: GPC are already in receipt of 4 full planning applications relating to part of their ‘masterplan’ which includes land which was recently purchased south of the JLR site. Again, the SPD is in formal draft before the Core Strategy is fully approved and not reflective of JLR’s land acquisition to accommodate continued expansion. The GLH plan reads as though it is expected to be solely for the purpose of housing future JLR/AML employees as the companies expand.

GPC have further concerns relating to the SPD’s recommendation that Transport, Environmental, Archaeological assessments should be conducted during planning stage rather than before the implementation of the Core Strategy. GPC are still unconvinced of the suitability of this location.

**6.3 Strategic Phasing**

The CS refers to 3000 dwellings yet the phasing in this document plans for 2300. What has happened to the other 700 houses? This mismatch potentially may adversely impact delivery of necessary infrastructure.

Though it is recognised that phasing is needed, more details of timing of key infrastructure building are required.

GPC feel the housing density is too high for a rural setting and should be reduced accordingly if the facilities are not in place to support them. Parking provision will also need to be delivered.

GPC feel that a precise plan of infrastructure, construction, and supply is required. Current guidance is vague and a clear time line with guarantees is essential. Our greatest concerns are those relating to Health facilities, (existing GP surgeries and dental services don’t have the capacity to cater for the additional patients) this is described as being completed in phase 3 which is too late.

The document states *‘The council recognises that some flexibility around the timing of delivery for different elements of infrastructure and affordable housing may be necessary’* GPC feel that there are important elements of infrastructure being delivered far too late which will result in other issues, not least of all integration.

**Phase 1 Development.**

Estimated to span over 10 years It is noted that the Village Centre may not be in place until completion of this phase (1000 homes: 2026)

GPC feel it is important to retain all existing footways and bridleways. The plan creates an idealistic view point that is unrealisable.

GPC note plans to make the B4100 30mph, which as a village concerned about speed in residential areas, GPC support. It is also noted that non-intrusive traffic calming will be provided and hope that the wider community will be considered when implementing such measures.

In regards to the new junction improving queues and congestion, GPC are sceptical about the junction’s ability to cope with projected JLR traffic, let alone that created by another 3000 houses.

**Education:**

Primary school planned for 2021/2022, GPC feel this is too late. The wider community and their children will also need to be considered when estimating capacity.

Secondary provision appears to be totally reliant upon the one local High School, although GPC supports plans to expand said school, there also appears to be a presumption that this will be funded by developer contributions without any clear timeline, other than ‘*within the next ten years…*’. It is as if the Schooling requirements of South Warwickshire as a whole have not been considered and a major opportunity has been missed.

**Traffic**:

*‘Construction of significant sections of primary internal distributor road’*: A major issue which hasn’t been realistically considered in terms of the delivery phase – timelines need to be clearer, local roads are already struggling to manage capacity. Traffic over past years has seen an ever increasing growth in volume. Full assessments must be undertaken that are impartial and reflect the traffic at the times of delivery of each phase.

Noise Attenuation bund: these needs to be completed as soon as possible not *‘as soon as is practicable.’*

**6.4 Phase 2/3**

Most of the infrastructure which GPC feel is non-negotiable is subject to developer contributions; especially health, school, traffic etc. These must be part of the phased delivery and must be guaranteed. GPC supports any move that realistically estimates demand for services so as to realistically estimate what the developer has to contribute.

**6.6 Community Governance**

GPC also has concerns relating to Governance or *‘overall management of the site’*. Each community is very individual with its own identity, which is very important to retain. One community happens to contain the largest employer in the area.

As a wider community, each element within it is very different and will each have very different ideals for the community. Residents of Gaydon want to live in a village, as do neighbouring villages and their communities. New residents may enjoy living on a large scale development, but this is what they chose to do. Although there could be some benefits to such a diverse neighbourhood, GPC feel shoe-horned into a new ‘site’ which threatens to undermine the local character

Although aspirations of integration are very noble, there is still a lot of opposition to many aspects of the strategy.

**Gaydon Parish Council Summary**

The SPD illustrates an idealised, very pleasant and tranquil development.

The reality is likely to be a little less idyllic: a modern, polluted, noisy, gridlocked development, which at the first sign of economic decline could become a ghost town; Bored teenagers, stranded miles from school friends and after school entertainment; Residents travelling (by car) to commercial centres outside of Stratford district, simply because Warwick, Leamington and Banbury are easier to access than Stratford town; 16 plus years of construction traffic, coating already congested roads with mud.

Finally; having spent many voluntary hours responding to GLH consultations even before confirmation that GLH will be included in the Core Strategy, Gaydon Parish Councillors are intrigued, that there doesn’t appear to be the similar attention being paid to the other elements of the CS: For example why has an SPD not yet been seen for Long Marsden Airfield? The impression this gives is that GLH is going to happen in spite of reasoned argument against its suitability.