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## Abstract.

Gaydon villagers have been surveyed in order to gauge their opinions on the proposal for a new settlement to the north of the village. The survey concludes that the majority of those who responded have an objection to the proposal. The main objections surround the fact that the majority of people who live in a village, chose to live in a village primarily because of its rural location.

 Another significant factor is the increase in traffic. Gaydon has suffered from traffic problems since the turn of the century when Jaguar joined Land rover at the Vehicle Development Centre. These issues have never been adequately addressed. It is believed that the proposed traffic improvements for the current capacity at the Vehicle Development Centre will be insufficient to meet the needs of the proposed new settlement.

There is a significant element that are open to the settlement proposal if it means that Gaydon will benefit from service improvements such as mains gas or fibre-optic high speed broadband. However, some ‘open’ responses are based on a belief that opposing the proposal is futile.
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## Introduction

Stratford District Council has a requirement to provide between 9,500 and 10,000 additional houses between 2008 and 2028.

 *“The independent review was carried out by Environmental Resources Management (ERM) and has recommended that the District Council should plan to provide between 9,500 and 10,000 additional houses over the period 2008 to 2028.”*

[[www.stratford.gov.uk/news/news.cfm/archive/1/item/135245](http://www.stratford.gov.uk/news/news.cfm/archive/1/item/135245)]

At the beginning of July 2013 District councillors introduced Parish councillors to the proposal for a new settlement between the M40 and the B4100 to the north of the village of Gaydon, encompassing the village of Lighthorne Heath. This revelation came as a shock to the Parish councillors and the villagers of Lighthorne, Gaydon and Lighthorne Heath.

Following a meeting of Lighthorne Heath PC at which District Councillors presented the proposal, it was decided a sub-committee should be set up to gauge the opinions of the residents of the affected villages.

The scope of this report is the opinions of the residents of the Village of Gaydon.

## The Survey

It would be easy to adopt a knee-jerk reaction of ‘nimbyism’ (Not in my back yard) and oppose the proposed settlement out of hand. However it was considered more democratic to conduct a survey of the village residents to gauge the consensus of feeling toward the proposal.

To this end a flyer was distributed to all residents via the Parish magazine which is distributed each month to the residents of Gaydon.

The flyer (see Appendix I) alerted residents to the proposed settlement, many of whom were unaware of the proposals, and it outlined the proposal giving direction to the Gaydon village web site and Stratford district council for further information. The flyer requested residents to indicate their preference of three options:

Yes – in favour of the settlement

No – Against the settlement

Open – for those who have no opinion on the matter or are open to the development with reservations.

Residents were instructed to respond by the 5th August by returning the flyer or via the email address on the Flyer

According to the 2001 census the population for Gaydon was 376 [2001 Census]. For the purposes of this survey the assumption is that the current (2013) population will be between 376 and 400.

200 Survey flyers were produced and distributed with the August edition of the Parish magazine. Additional flyers were placed on the counter of the village shop.

## Survey Results

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| Flyers distributed | 200 |
| Flyers returned (by 12:00 6/8/13) | 41 |
| Residents represented by returned flyers | 59 |
| Responses by email (Residents represented) | 13 |
| Total No. of residents responded | 72 |
|  |  |
| Yes | 9 |
| No | 41 |
| Open | 22 |

A list of respondents can be found in Appendix II

## Analysis of results

Assuming 400 residents, 18-19% of residents have responded. Assumptions can be made for reasons that other responses were not received. These may include: non receipt of flyer, residents on holiday, apathy over survey, futility of contesting the proposal, apathy over the development.

57% of those who have responded object to the settlement.

12.5% of those who responded welcome the settlement.

30.5% have reservations about the proposals and the effects, positive or negative, of the settlement

## Respondents Comments

The following comments have been compiled from the comments given by respondents. Comments have been combined, abridged, and paraphrased. Original comments are available on the respondent’s original correspondence.

These are personal comments of respondents; the author cannot vouch for their accuracy and validity

## Comments in favour of settlement

|  |
| --- |
| Energy (Vibrancy) of locality |
| Investment |
| Local economy boost |
| Employment |
| Increase property prices within village centres  |
| Local amenities |
| Housing needs |

## ‘OPEN’ comments

In the event of the development preceding against the wishes of the local residents the following should be considered.

|  |
| --- |
| Smaller development - extension to Lighthorne Heath |
| Industrial units to be located nearer JLR |
| Settlement should not be started until infrastructure is in place. Including Gas and Fibre optic HS Broadband to surrounding villages |
| Schools, shops and Amenities should be in the centre of the Housing development |
| Bus service Every 20-30mins Leamington/Warwick to Banbury 06.00-00.00 |
| The settlement Name should bear no relation to the name ‘Gaydon’ |
| Sufficient Parking required for JLR/AM and industrial developments. Minimum 2/3rds No of employees |
| Promise of no further developments in the Gaydon area |
| The land between new bypass and the B4100/B4451 roundabout to be conservation green-field/woodland |
| No future development to the west of B4100, south of Heritage centre and north of B4451 |
| Improved drainage for the whole of Gaydon village |

## Comments against the settlement

|  |
| --- |
| Village Identity |
|  | This is a Rural Location |
|  | The people who live in Gaydon do so because they didn’t want to live in a town; they wanted the rural location |
|  | The village will become a conurbation of the new town and lose its identity and Character |
|  | Will drive out locals |
| Traffic/Transport |
|  | Potentially 12,000 (2-3 cars per dwelling) more vehicles using the roads |
|  | Express Bus lanes would not work without dualling the B4100 from Leamington to Banbury |
|  | Construction traffic for 14 years plus |
|  | Schools will draw pupils from surrounding area at the same time JLR/AM traffic is at its peak |
|  | Will draw more traffic from Kineton and the surrounding villages. The junction with the B4451 will once again become a bottleneck |
|  | No Rail Link |
|  | Revised M40 J12 and associated road developments will be obsolete before they are begun. This would be a repeat of the miscalculation made when the Gaydon roundabout was considered an adequate improvement, despite the suggestion being made by local residents at the time for a 'by-pass' similar to the one now being planned |
| Suitability of land |
|  | Loss of agricultural land. |
|  | Building on a Land fill site. Risk of subsidence to new properties |
|  | Destruction of Greenbelt |
|  | There are Brown field sites that would be environmentally preferable |
|  | There is no doubt people will buy the properties, but do people really 'want' to live on top of a Motorway |
| Environment |
|  | SDC Policy CS10 applies |
|  | Light Pollution. The development is on high ground and will be seen for miles around. |
|  | Noise Pollution from industrial units, construction traffic, general traffic. |
|  | New houses will be exposed to Pollution from land fill site  |
|  | Destruction of Wildlife Habitat |
|  | Reduction of the country's ability to be self sufficient through the loss of agricultural land, with the knock-on effect of increased food miles |
| Crime |
|  | An increase is to be expected in crime where there will be many adolescents stuck out in the middle of nowhere with nothing to do. |
| MoD Kineton |
|  | Increase of Population within Vulnerable Building distance of DM Kineton. |
|  |
| Flooding |
|  | The 2012 Draft Core strategy Sect.6.2.1 Policy CS3 A - Flood risk areas States:- **"There is a presumption against development in flood risk areas"** Whilst Gaydon probably doesn't qualify as a 'flood risk area' as defined by SDC or the EA, there is no doubt, as history has shown (2007), it is at risk of floodingSection 6.2.1. Policy CS3 B - Surface water run-off and sustainable Urban drainage systems States:-**"Development which increases the risk of flooding elsewhere will not be permitted unless satisfactory mitigation measures accompany the proposal"** |
|  | Gaydon already suffers from flooding in extreme conditions. Concreting over a large area at the top of a hill is likely to exacerbate this making flooding more frequent. Should the run-off not go toward Gaydon it may affect the M40. |
| Employment |
|  | Assuming that this development is for the benefit of JLR employees it must be remembered that the motor industry in the recent past has been subject to dramatic changes in fortune and is dependent on the whim of the designers and product strategists as well as market forces.  |
| Housing needs |
|  | This settlement does not meet the housing needs of the local surroundings. It will draw populous from other JLR sites in Coventry and Birmingham. Not to mention India, China and Saudi Arabia |
|  | Developments should be small and local to individual villages to meet the needs of the district population not those of the companies from Birmingham, Coventry and Newport Pagnall |
| Property values |
|  | Fear of loss of property values; especially during construction of the settlement. |
| Local Capacities |
|  | Sewerage  |
|  | Water Pressure |
|  | Roads |
|  | Hospitals: Warwick Hospital has difficulty coping now! |

## Stratford District Council - Core Strategy issues

A review of SDC’s Draft Core strategy uncovered several reasons why this development should not proceed. This list is not exhaustive.

|  |
| --- |
| Strategic Objectives |
|  | This development fails to meet the requirements of Strategic objectives 1, 2 and 8 as laid down in the DCS 2012 |
| Draft Strategic Core Strategy - 2012 |
|  | 9.03 -"Aim for lower net migration" This development will draw in people from other JLR/AM locations who currently commute from Birmingham and Coventry-"Preserve the special nature of the district"-"Duty to protect our countryside for future generations" |
|  | 9.04-"New housing to be dispersed across the district"-"Preserve character of settlements"-"Maximum development size of 100 homes, but aim for small developments especially in rural settlements"-"Re use Brownfield sites in preference to new Greenfield sites" |
|  | 9.05"In respect of developments outside Stratford, it is proposed that the maximum estate size is smaller than 100 homes and no more than 2%of the existing housing stock to lessen the impacts of development upon the character of smaller settlements in the district." |
|  | 9.11- All points |
| 2010 Justification for the Preferred Development Strategy |
|  | **Option 4**:  **Focus on a new settlement or major expansion of existing settlement** The new settlement approach would not be consistent with meeting local needswhere they arise. It is likely to come into the reckoning only if the housing requirement for Stratford District is increased significantly to the extent that the scale of growth could not be met satisfactorily in existing settlement*[justification for preferred development strategy -2010]* |
|  | **Option 4**: **Best performing option for the following factors:**None**Worst performing option for the following factors**:-least popular in consultation response-tackling disadvantage (joint)-sustainable economic growth (joint)  |

## General Comments

The District plan is too constrained there may be more suitable locations for such a development within Warwickshire which do not fall within Stratford District e.g. ones with a railway line or better motorway access.

It is strange that there are no alternative proposals to be considered in parallel with this proposal.

## Criticism of Stratford District Council

|  |
| --- |
| Suspected JLR involvement and undue influence in over development of the area |
| Doubts over Council/councillor integrity |
| Appalling lack of prior consultation |
| The secrecy and short notice of this development considering it must have been some time in the planning. |
| Doubts that any promised benefits will not be honoured |
| Phase I up to 2028 is only for 1900 houses. This means that for the remaining development, a flow of construction traffic up to and well beyond 2028! |
| Inconsistency:New proposals consultation states 9,500 houses required. The ERM says 9,500 to 10,000 |
| 4,800 houses is part of the 9,500 housing requirement for 2028: yet only 1900 will be built by 2028. So why are the remaining 2900 houses required? |
| Too easy an option for SDC to solve most of it's housing requirement in one fell swoop, rather than meeting the local housing needs of individual villages and towns |
| Doubts that their voices will be heard |

## Summary

Every attempt has been made to make this survey unbiased and the respondents have not been led or directed in any way. No discussion has been held with any respondent prior to receipt of their response. Respondents were however encouraged to understand the proposal by visiting websites or contacting SDC.

The level of response is open to debate. By population the response is in the region of 18%; however as a percentage of flyers distributed the response could be read as somewhere between 21 and 35%

The results as they are read are conclusively against the settlement.

 Hypothetically if it is assumed that all the ‘OPEN’ comments were technically in favour of the settlement, then the result would be 42.5% for, 57% against. However from the comments made by some of the ‘OPEN’ respondents, not all are in favour, just resigned to the proposal going forward in spite of local opposition. Consequently the overall consensus of the people of Gaydon is that the proposed settlement should not be built.

**Appendix I**

**4800**

New houses to be built on your door step

***How do you feel about this?***

You may be aware that Stratford on Avon District Council are considering a proposal to site 4800 houses and associated amenities, including some commercial/industrial units, schools etc., on the land bounded by the M40, the B4100, the Old Gated Road and the Kineton/Southam Road.

Gaydon Parish council wishes to canvass the general feeling of the village. Please complete this form and return it to Briar Cottage, Church Rd. Gaydon.

Alternatively: email AClx10@aol.com with ‘YES’, ‘NO’ or ‘Open’ as the subject.

**Responses are required by MONDAY 5th AUGUST**

Please mark the relevant box below:

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| **YES** | I am in favour of the DevelopmentPlease give your reasons on the back of this form |  |
| **NO** | I wish to object to the Development Please give your reasons on the back of this form |  |
| **Open**  | I am Neither for or against – or - I am open to discussion (e.g. ‘What’s in it for Gaydon?’) Comments please on the back of the form. |  |

Your name: …………………………………………………………………………

Your address:

…………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………………

\*Phone No.: ………………………………………………………………………

\*Email: ……………………………………………………………………………..

*\*optional*

Personal details will be used only for the purposes of this survey to confirm the validity and avoid duplication of the submission; unless you have ticked the box below

If you wish to be kept informed about developments in this matter please tick this box