

[REDACTED]

---

**From:**

[REDACTED]  
13 May 2025 17:21

**To:**

Local Plan

**Cc:**

Shilton

**Subject:**

Objections to and Request for Explanation of, Aspects of the Proposed Rugby Local Plan

Dear Planning Team,

The Shilton and Barnacle Parish Council would like to once again register our objections to the proposed local plan. As there are certain aspects of this plan that do not make sense to us, we would also like to request that you explain why you have chosen these as the preferred choices rather than alternatives that would not only be fairer on all communities involved, but would then follow your own and the police's guidelines on siting sites for Gypsies & Travellers (G&T).

In section 4 of the local plan we see that the adoption of the Gypsy and Traveller Site Allocations Development Plan Document (DPD) would like to include all of the currently unapproved sites around Barnacle. This seems to ignore some significant factors. These include.

1. In 2023 the Shilton & Barnacle Parish Council along with RBC Councillor Becky Maoudis met with Nicola Smith and members of her planning team to discuss the concentration of G&T sites around Barnacle. Nicola promised to review the allocation and see what alternatives could be considered. The main change to existing policy was to try and allocate sites on employment land instead of greenbelt around Barnacle. We haven't seen any evidence of this happening. **Can you please provide evidence of where RBC plan to allocate G&T sites to reduce the concentration here?**
2. Section 4.23 acknowledges that PPTS makes it clear that "releasing land from the Green Belt should be done through the plan-making process and that this should only be done in exceptional circumstances". Section 4.24 states that "the Council will consider whether there are exceptional circumstances". The decision to dismiss the recent appeal by residents of Top Park 2 for planning permission shows that such exceptional circumstances do not exist here. **Why has this not been recognised?**
3. A few months ago we called out RBC Planning to inspect the continuous movement of caravans on and off the Top Park sites. Because of the traffic congestion caused by the movement of this caravan in question, the inspectors were unable to get to Top Park to inspect. Obviously this shows the problems that this concentration of caravans here makes, but this isn't mentioned in your notes. **Do you not consider this a problem?**
4. Since this preferred local plan was published, the majority of the G&T owners of Top Park have taken to letting caravans to non-travellers rather than occupying them, themselves. Clearly this demonstrates that the provision that these sites provide is not actually required. **Are you going to adjust your requirements with this new information?**
5. You state in section 4.25 that there are another 18 G&T pitches also not currently occupied by the G&T community but that they may be required in future years. **If they can be let out in future years why can they not given for G&T accommodation now in order to reduce the**

**concentration of pitches in the areas of highest concentration? Can we also ask for a list of these pitches please?**

6. I've been told that one possibility of planning regulations is to include conditions that will limit the planning approval to the named applicants when planning is granted. **Have these conditions been used to ensure that only G&T residents occupy G&T pitches? If not, why not?**

We would also like to object to the unnecessary building of new housing on green belt in other areas of Wolvey, Brinklow and this area. The numbers are not suitable to maintain the character of any of these villages and this risks turning areas that are currently desirable into areas that strain the local infrastructure.

Many thanks for your time and effort in answering the above questions and ensuring that our objections to your plan are duly considered.

Regards,

[Redacted Signature]