

Objection to Spring Hill, New Arley Housing Development

To:	Planning Department, North Warwickshire Borough Council	
Re:	Land at Spring Hill, New Arley Ref: PAP/2026/0074	
From:		Date:
Address:		

Dear Planning Officer / Members of the Planning Committee,

I am writing to object to the above planning application for the following reasons:

1. Arley Neighbourhood Plan

The proposed Spring Hill development conflicts with the Arley Neighbourhood Plan because it sits outside the village's designated development boundary, undermines the parish's rural character, threatens protected green spaces and woodland connections, and exceeds the scale and type of growth the plan supports.

2. Harm to the Green Belt

The site lies within the Green Belt and the proposal would significantly reduce openness and introduce an urban estate form. No very special circumstances have been demonstrated.

3. Disproportionate Scale of Development

New Arley is identified for limited growth only. Adding up to 220 homes represents an approximate 30% expansion, which is not proportionate and would overwhelm local services.

4. Risk to Daffern's Wood (Ancient Woodland)

The development borders irreplaceable Ancient Semi-Natural Woodland. A minimum 15m buffer is insufficient and no evidence demonstrates that deterioration can be avoided.

5. Lack of Confirmed Capacity at Schools and GP Practices

No Health Impact Assessment or confirmed education/healthcare capacity has been submitted. Financial contributions alone cannot resolve physical and staffing constraints.

6. Flood Risk and Drainage Concerns

LLFA advice identifies an ordinary watercourse and failed soakage testing. A viable drainage solution has not been demonstrated.

7. Utilities and Electricity Infrastructure Constraints

Overhead electricity lines cross the site with no confirmed easements or network operator approval, creating risks for supply reliability and maintenance access.

8. Highways and Access Deliverability

Required visibility splays depend on works to third-party land, and safe access is therefore not guaranteed.

9. Ground Contamination Risks

Historic land use indicates risks from metals, PAHs, asbestos, and mine gas. No Phase II investigation has been carried out to confirm safety.

10. Road Safety Concerns

Spring Hill lacks footpaths under the railway bridge, already suffers from high vehicle speeds, and would see a 60–75% traffic increase. Safety risks to pedestrians and Arley Primary School pupils would worsen, and proposed mitigation measures are not guaranteed.

Request

I ask the Council to refuse the application. If it is not refused, it should not be determined until clear evidence and secured mitigation are provided for road safety, drainage/flood risk, protection of Daffern's Wood, ground contamination risks and local infrastructure capacity.

Yours faithfully,
