

#1

COMPLETE

**Collector:** Web Link 1 (Web Link)  
**Started:** Monday, May 19, 2025 3:38:44 PM  
**Last Modified:** Monday, May 19, 2025 4:22:36 PM  
**Time Spent:** 00:43:52  
**IP Address:** [REDACTED]

---

## Page 1: Introduction

**Q1** **Neither Agree nor Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with the selection of these objectives?

---

**Q2**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 1?

Some objectives are sound; objective (1) is not as it places an Economic Strategy above principles of land-use planning and sustainable development which should be to focus development on the existing urban area and its current growth directions; not locate development in Green Belt or rural land beyond the Green Belt.

---

## Page 2: Strategy for homes and residential allocations (policies S2 and S6)

**Q3** **Strongly Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with the more dispersed overall spatial strategy for new homes?

---

**Q4**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 3 and if you disagree with the proposed spatial strategy what alternative should we pursue?

There is no need for another 'large site' in or adjacent to Rugby and the 'dispersal strategy' is not sound - it would locate new development in or next to villages which would lose their character, and would require loss of Green Belt. The New Standard Method projection for annual housing requirement does not change total annual need much from previous methodology so a new strategy is not required that differs from the adopted Plan. That excluded almost all sites in Green Belt and the Lodge Farm (Willoughby) location. Development should use land in the urban area, the Houlton (east) area, and South West Rugby.

---

**Q5**

Is there a site that is proposed to be allocated for housing in policy S6 that you do not support? If so, which site and why?

We oppose the housing allocations proposed at Brinklow, Wolvey, Long Lawford, Stretton-on-Dunsmore, Swift Valley and Clifton-on-Dunsmore.

---

**Q6**

**Respondent skipped this question**

The development sites annex lists development requirements for the allocated sites. Are there additional or different requirements we should be seeking? Please specify which site you are referring to.

---

Page 3: Strategy for employment land and employment allocations (policies S3 and S7)

**Q7**

**Strongly Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with the strategy for employment land?

---

**Q8**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 7? If you disagree, what alternative location(s) would be better and why?

The scale of employment land proposed in the Plan is excessive. There is a considerable supply at present without taking any land out of Green Belt. The locations 5 and 6 listed -  
- South of the village of Ansty near M6 Junction 2  
- At Ryton-on-Dunsmore between Prologis Park and Coventry Airport.  
are not needed and not justified.

The proposed redevelopment of Coventry Airport in Warwick District (if it proceeds) will be relevant new employment land provision for Rugby District.

The 'WMSESS' is not a strategy for employment land that has been subject to public consultation and will not itself be examined as a DPD. It should not be relied on as grounds for new employment land allocations.

---

Page 4: Gypsy and Traveller sites (policy S4)

**Q9**

**Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with policy S4?

---

**Q10**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 9?

We do not support any new greenfield sites for Travellers and none should be located in the Green Belt. The existing site in Siskin Drive (Coventry, next to Rugby boundary) may be suitable for expansion.

---

Page 5: Climate

**Q11**

**Strongly Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with the approach to reducing emissions and adapting to the effects of climate change?

---

**Q12**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 11?

(1) CPRE Warwickshire opposes identifying areas as suitable for wind turbines on the policies map. This would be very damaging. The landscape of rural Rugby District is not suitable for wind turbines as the refusal of turbines by Secretary of State at Churchover showed. Industrial sites (such as DIRFT) can be considered if the turbines are not more than 50M high. The policy does not mention any policy on controlling solar farms. It should state that solar arrays on agricultural land will not be permitted and that they will be supported on industrial and warehouse roofs. There are many large recent industrial and distribution buildings (B8) on which solar panels can be installed. But unless the policy prevents them being put on farmland and open land, the solar industry will not use industrial and warehouse roofs.

---

Page 6: Economy

**Q13**

**Agree**

To what extent do you agree with the document's economic policies?

---

**Q14**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 13?

Broadly agree; however, uses that support the rural economy (such as agricultural buildings, small-scale tourist accommodation, and garden centres and nurseries) should be strictly controlled to use existing sites, and not extend onto open land and farmland now used for cultivation and grazing.

---

Page 7: Centres

**Q15**

**Agree**

To what extent do you agree with the policies for retail centres?

---

**Q16**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 15?

These are sound policies for the urban area.

---

Page 8: Environment

**Q17**

**Agree**

To what extent do you agree with the document's environmental policies?

---

**Q18**

**Respondent skipped this question**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 17?

---

Page 9: Housing

**Q19**

**Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with the document's housing policies?

---

**Q20**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 19?

" Small sites for affordable housing shall be permitted on sites adjacent to settlements, including in the Green Belt, where there is a demonstrable need" - CPRE does not support 'adjacent to settlements' as this would enable extension into the Green Belt in some places. Small sites in villages (infill sites) should be supported.

---

Page 10: Wellbeing

**Q21**

**Neither Agree nor Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with the document's wellbeing policies?

---

**Q22**

**Respondent skipped this question**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 21?

---

Page 11: Design

**Q23**

**Agree**

To what extent do you agree with the document's design policies?

---

**Q24**

**Respondent skipped this question**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 23?

---

Page 12: Infrastructure

**Q25**

**Neither Agree nor Disagree**

To what extent do you agree with the document's infrastructure policies?

---

**Q26**

What are the reasons for your answer to question 25?

The 'Rugby Parkway' station is actually a proposal for a station on the Northampton Loop line of the WCML serving Houlton and it would be better called that.

The 'Nuneaton Parkway' proposal has no basis and Nuneaton needs investment in its present station, not another station which would take business away from the town station. Reference to it should be dropped.

---

Page 13: Any Other Feedback

**Q27**

If there are any other comments you wish to make regarding the consultation document which you have not already given in your preceding answers, please enter them here:

See separate responsae on the Plan submitted by CPRE Warwickshire - not able to be pasted into the questionnaire responses.

---

Page 14: About you

**Q28**

What is your name?

[REDACTED]

**Q29**

What organisation are you representing, if applicable?

[REDACTED]

**Q30**

Other

Are you a resident of Rugby Borough?

**Q31**

Your contact email

[REDACTED]

**Q32**

Your contact address

[REDACTED]

**Q33**

Your Postcode

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	

---

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	

---

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	

---

[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]	

---