

## PAILTON PARISH COUNCIL – RESPONSE TO PREFERRED OPTIONS CONSULTATION

### S1 A

i - We agree with this

ii - We agree to support villages with neighbourhood plans which allow for sustainable growth through the plan . We do not support the proposed green belt developments in Brinklow and Wolvey, these are in an unsustainable location.

iii – We agree, limited development only as identified in housing needs surveys and within a village boundary.

### S2

A +B - The reduction of the local plan length to 2042 reduces homes by 1854 which would eradicate the need for the green belt development. A provision has been made for 14,134 homes when only 12,978 are required. Grey/brown field sites and developments not in the green belt should be given the upmost focus.

### S3

Allocations for Coton park should be for housing needs as it was intended to be. Employment land should be moved to the previously proposed sites by the Gibbet hill junction of the A5 (site 132). This junction is due to be improved by national highways in the near future and the planning authority should work alongside national highway. The improved infrastructure would benefit both employment facilities and residential.

### S4

A - Every site listed has been built without permission as unauthorised intentional development. We suggest these sites are located in the most sustainable areas and situated on employment sites.

B - These policies are unenforceable.

### S5

B – What are the exceptional circumstances for green belt policy breaking re Wolvey and Brinklow.

C - We agree.

### S6

If new homes are focused on Rugby Town, homes should be built close to the most sustainable areas. We believe there are sites closer to urban development e.g Rounds gardens, GEC football pitch, clock towers. These sites are the most sustainable and within walking distance to the town centre, train station, bus station and Caldicott park.

S7

See S3 answer

S8

Even though there is proposal for a new road, people will still drive through the village of Dunchurch.

CL

1 - Self-generation targets are impossible to meet, why are warehouses not having solar panels fitted to the roofs?

The house self generation targets will deter builders and make homes unaffordable.

Solar is reliant on the aspect of the property.

2 – Very special circumstances re the greenbelt, use urban areas and reduce the length of the plan.

4a - Flood risked have already been identified in Wolvey after the completion of the new development.

E

2 – Why are we not regenerating office space within the town centre to reduce building elsewhere. E.g above shops in sheep street and high street.

3 – We are in support of all improvements to rural economy.

EN

3 – We note that the Brinklow and Wolvey developments conflict with the policy.

4 – Trees need to be planted in a suitable location and not on productive farmland.

5 – Canopy cover of tree would impede solar production, consideration should be give to the type of trees to avoid issues with root spread.

6 – Restrict building to a minimum of 16 meters from flood zone not the proposed 8.

8 – Unsustainable development create poorer air quality to added traffic movements, proposed Brinklow and Wolvey developments are unsustainable.

## H

2 – Increased build costs due to unachievable green standards will eradicate affordable housing.

3 – Need better evidence that a farm worker lives in the property.

4 – Community led in perpetuity.

## W

1B – We are in support of this and Newbold rugby club should be added.

2 – Rural sports pitches and playing field should be added here.

## D

1 – House designs should be in keeping with the area, e.g. linear development.

3 – Think about the future e.g. where the trees are planted.

5 – Sustainable builds should always be well outside the flood plain.

## I

1B – Development should be located where car travel is minimised.

2 – 1 bed houses should have 2 parking spaces at a minimum, every added bedroom should increase the parking spaces by 1.

4 – Mitigation of affordable housing or infrastructure on number of dwellings is not acceptable. This could make the development a nonstarter.

6 – Very poor road network to the proposed new secondary school. We would suggest positioning the school and housing on Coton East. There is already a primary school provision there.