

#1

COMPLETE

Collector: Web Link 1 (Web Link)
Started: Monday, May 19, 2025 9:34:13 AM
Last Modified: Monday, May 19, 2025 1:04:33 PM
Time Spent: 03:30:20
IP Address: [REDACTED]

Page 1: Introduction

Q1 **Strongly Agree**

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

Q2

What are the reasons for your answer to question 1?

WDH strongly supports the objectives of the draft plan, particularly the following objectives:

- Objective 4 - raise design standards
- Objective 5 deliver infrastructure-led growth
- Objective 6 facilitate a greener, more diverse borough

WDH takes pride in delivering high-quality developments which is reflected in its five star status for 10 years running, as rated by the Homes Builders Federation's annual survey of homeowners.

The previously submitted vision document for site reference 315 incorporates a concept masterplan which highlights how the site could accommodate homes as well as green and blue infrastructure in a high quality attractive design, consistent with the objectives of the draft local plan.

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

Q3 **Strongly Agree**

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?

Settlement Hierarchy

WDH strongly supports the settlement hierarchy outlined under draft Policy S1 and the proposed dispersed development strategy under policies S2 and S6. The settlement hierarchy is reliably underpinned by the up-to-date Rural Sustainability Study (December 2024) which forms part of the local plan evidence base.

The settlement of Brinklow is identified to be the fourth highest sustainable rural settlement in the study and has a range of essential and desirable facilities that will mutually support and be economically supported by new residential development including a post office, several public houses, a shop, recreation ground, allotments and children's nursery. Furthermore, the study acknowledges that Brinklow also has good public transport connections. If the study considered the ratio of services to homes within any given village, Brinklow would be the highest by some margin. It is therefore wholly appropriate that Brinklow is identified as a location for growth.

Policies S2 (setting out housing need) and S6 (identifying residential allocations) are supported by the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) Interim Report dated March 2025. The SA has considered 'reasonable alternative' methods to determining housing need and also considered reasonable alternative sites which may be appropriate for residential development, in accordance with the PPG (Paragraph: 034 Reference ID: 61-034-20190315). WDH therefore considers that the policies are sound.

Strategy for Homes

Since the NPPF was first published in 2012, the government's objective has been to significantly boost the supply of homes. This is set out in paragraph 61 of the NPPF (2024) alongside requirements for planning authorities to provide a sufficient amount and variety of land, to meet the needs of groups with specific housing requirements and to provide an appropriate mix of housing.

The government updated the standard method in December 2024 and this indicated that the local housing need for Rugby Borough is 618 dwellings per annum.

WDH strongly supports RBC's dispersed strategy and notes that it complies with the NPPF paragraph 73 which acknowledges that small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting housing requirement of an area as they are essential for small and medium enterprise housebuilders to deliver homes.

Carefully allocating sites in rural settlements enables them to grow sustainably in accordance with paragraph 83 of the NPPF which states that planning policies should identify opportunities for villages to grow and thrive.

Draft policy S2 plans for 14,134 homes between 2024 and 2045 (21-year plan period), equating to an annual average of 673 dwellings per annum (dpa). The overall level of housing is therefore greater than the 618 dwellings required to accord with the standard method and is a very sensible, pragmatic and appropriate way of securing housing delivery over the plan period. However, the HEDNA demonstrates a need for 496 affordable housing dwellings per annum (dpa) which equates to 80% of the standard method figure. Given that the local plan does not have an 80% affordable housing target, the local plan will not satisfy the identified need for affordable housing unless the overall housing requirement for the district is increased. In accordance with the PPG (Paragraph: 024 Reference ID: 2a-024-20190220) we would therefore urge Rugby Borough Council to increase the level of proposed housing delivery beyond the 9% buffer currently proposed in order to increase the overall supply of badly needed affordable housing in the district.

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?

N/A

Q6

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.

Questionnaire on Rugby's Preferred Options Consultation Document

Residential Allocations: Ref. 315 Land south of Rugby Road (340 dwellings)

WDH supports the allocation of land to the south of Rugby Road for 340 dwellings. WDH considers that the allocation occupies a sustainable location for development with all potential environmental constraints capable of being satisfactorily addressed.

tor&co prepared a vision document for part of the site in 2024 and forwarded a copy to the council. This document shows how up to 100 dwellings, public open space, landscape planting and ancillary infrastructure including surface water drainage attenuation could be delivered. The concept masterplan has had careful regard to landscape, heritage and ecological constraints and has further considered the opportunities to ensure that the site is well connected to the existing settlement. It also shows that the existing facilities, services and amenities in Brinklow are located within a short walking distance of the site and would not require use of a private car. The bus stops located on Coventry Road 150m west of the site provide public transport options to access Rugby and Coventry.

Since the production of this masterplan, WDH's appointed consultant team has undertaken further detailed design work associated with the site's development including:

- a Rugby Road access design and pedestrian crossing plan
- a Heath Lane access design and pedestrian crossing plan
- a heritage technical note prepared by GHC Archaeology and Heritage Ltd (dated May 2025) which carefully considers the impact of residential development on heritage assets
- an ecological constraints summary report which identifies what opportunities can be incorporated into the scheme design to mitigate and / or enhance ecology and biodiversity.

These documents have been submitted separately to Rugby Borough Council.

WDH, in agreement with all relevant landowners, is committed to bringing forward and delivering the preferred option allocation reference 315 (land to the south of Rugby Road, Brinklow) under policy S6 as a well planned, comprehensive development. The vision document helps demonstrate how the allocation would contribute positively towards meeting local housing needs in Brinklow, including the provision of affordable homes.

Whilst WDH supports the proposed allocation of site 315 (land south of Rugby Road for 340 dwellings), WDH wishes to suggest a number of amendments to the development requirements for the site as set out in the annex to the local plan.

Firstly, the second bullet point requires provision to be made for self-build and custom-build plots as part of the proposed development. However, it fails to specify how many plots need to be provided or that there is actually a demonstrable need for such plots in Brinklow. As the council's April 2025 self-build register shows only one request for a plot in Brinklow, there is no substantive evidence of a clear need for the site to make provision for self-build plots.

Secondly, the third bullet requires vehicular access to be provided from Brays Close, with a secondary access from Heath Lane. WDH considers that Brays Close (a cul-de-sac) does not provide a suitable (or indeed the optimum) location for a new access to serve the development of 340 dwellings. WDH has undertaken detailed access design work which evidences that safe access / egress can be achieved directly from Rugby Road and Heath Lane as shown on the Rugby Road access design and pedestrian crossing plan and the Heath Lane access design and pedestrian crossing plan prepared by Roberts Highway Consultants and which have been submitted separately to the council.

The proposed access point from Rugby Road is located within the vicinity of the existing vehicular access to the field. WDH suggests that this is the optimum location for the site access, with an accompanying requirement for the access into Brays Close to be closed and re-provided via the proposed allocation. As can be seen from the concept masterplan and the detailed access plan, the delivery of a new access into Brays Close is eminently achievable and would ensure that there are not two junctions on the same side of Rugby Road within proximity of each other. WDH considers that a proposed access from Rugby Road and the closure of the Brays Close access could also improve the setting of the conservation area opposite.

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

Q7

No Answer

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?

No comment.

Page 4: Gypsy and Traveller sites (policy S4)

Q9

No Answer

To what extent do you agree with policy S4?

Q10

What are the reasons for your answer to question 9?

No comment.

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?

Firstly, WDH notes that the 'Net Zero Evidence' which sets out the robust evidence base for Policy CL1 Net Zero Buildings has not been published. Similarly, the Water Cycle Study - stage 2 report which is intended to build on the evidence presented in the Stage 1 report, and where necessary, update it, is also a forthcoming document and not yet been published. Given the absence of evidence, WDH ultimately considers that this policy is unsound.

Draft Policy CL1 (Net Zero Buildings) requires that new buildings must be designed and built to be net zero carbon in operation. Draft Policy CL4 (Climate Adaptation) sets out that all development shall be resilient to and adapt to the future impacts of climate change.

WDH supports the ambition for development proposals to mitigate and adapt to climate change, as well as helping the district meet its targets. This aligns with WDH's Environmental, Social and Governance (ESG) Strategy which seeks for its homes to use renewable energy technology where possible, meet or exceed current building regulations, maximise the efficient use of resources by using fewer raw materials and less energy, and use construction materials that originate from sustainable sources where possible.

However, WDH does not fully support the approach to Policy CL1, which it does not consider to be effective. WDH supports the principle of this policy and is committed to ensure the business plays its role in delivering carbon reductions and planning for a sustainable future. However, the requirements currently set out in the policy go beyond the scope of the Building Regulations.

It is the government's intention to set standards for energy efficiency through the Building Regulations. The key to success is standardisation and avoidance of individual councils specifying their own policy approach to energy efficiency, which undermines economies of scale for product manufacturers, suppliers and developers. The 'Planning Local Energy Efficiency Standards Update' parliamentary statement made on 13 December 2023 (see <https://questions-statements.parliament.uk/written-statements/detail/2023-12-13/hlws120>) states that there is no need for councils to set standards which go above nationally set standards. Furthermore, the statement recognises for local plans to be sound, they must be consistent with national policy to enable the delivery of sustainable development.

Rugby Borough Council does not need to define how homes will be constructed to be zero carbon ready or set local energy efficiency standards to achieve the shared net zero goal, because of the higher levels of energy efficiency standards for new homes set out in the Building Regulations. As such, criterion 2 should be amended to comply with the relevant national standards / Building Regulations to ensure that a consistent approach is applied across the UK. Provision of more onerous local policy requirements would potentially risk the viability of delivering new housing and/or reduce affordability in the borough.

WDH recognises and supports the need for development to reduce its carbon emissions. However, rather than placing additional requirements that are considered unnecessary and unjustified, it is considered that the most effective way of achieving this is through strict adherence to Building Regulations as they are updated over time.

Current standards (adopted 15 June 2022) require all new residential dwellings to produce 31% less carbon emissions than is currently acceptable in the Part L 2013 Building Regulations. The requirement for new residential development to be built to net zero carbon in operation is not consistent with national policy and therefore unsound.

WDH recommends that policy CL1 should be re-worded to allow the policy to respond to adopted national standards. The policy should also include viability considerations so that it does not hinder the development of suitable sites.

Furthermore, WDH also considers that to retain flexibility on development sites, ensure development viability and assist sustainable sites coming forward, WDH suggests that draft Policy CL4 be amended as follows:

"All development shall be resilient to, and adapt to the future impacts of, climate change, where feasible and viable".

WDH has no comments relating to draft policy CL2 (Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technology)

Questionnaire on Rugby's Preferred Options Consultation Document

WDH has no comments relating to draft policy CL2 (Renewable Energy and Low Carbon Technology).

Criterion C of draft policy CL3 (Water supply, Quality and Efficiency) states that "new dwellings shall demonstrate that they are water efficient...and that the estimated consumption of wholesome water per dwelling, as calculated in accordance with the methodology in the water efficiency calculator, does not exceed 110 litres per person per day in line with regulation 36(2)(b) of the Building Regulations 2020 (as amended)".

Supporting paragraph 2.8 elaborates that the latest Water Cycle Study (2024) suggests there is justification to require the highest possible water efficient standards and this has been corroborated by Severn Trent Valley. However, the latest Water Cycle Study - stage 2 report is a forthcoming document which is yet to be published. Given the absence of evidence, WDH considers that this policy is unsound.

Page 6: Economy

Q13

No Answer

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

Q14

What are the reasons for your answer to question 13?

No comment.

Page 7: Centres

Q15

No Answer

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

Q16

What are the reasons for your answer to question 15?

No comment.

Page 8: Environment

Q17

Disagree

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

Q18

What are the reasons for your answer to question 17?

Draft policy EN1 (Biodiversity and Geodiversity Protection) asserts that national policy and legislation will be applied in determining planning applications that have the potential to harm biodiversity and development that affects a Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI), protected species or irreplaceable habitat such as ancient woodland or veteran trees.

WDH strongly believes in conserving biodiversity and supports local planning policy aligning with overarching national policy to guide plans and ensure consistency in approach to development across England. WDH therefore supports the principles of this policy. WDH also supports the pragmatism of criterion C which asserts that any development likely to result in harm to or the loss of a Local Wildlife, Local Nature Reserve or Local Geological Site will not be permitted unless it is justified that the:

- C. i. need for or benefits of the development demonstrably outweigh the harm to ecological / geological interests of the site
- C. iii. The harm is minimised and mitigated or compensated for in accordance with the mitigation hierarchy

However, WDH is concerned that criterion C(ii) is onerous because it states that it must be demonstrated that the development, "could not reasonably be located on an alternative site that would cause less harm". WDH considers that criterion (ii) should be deleted because criteria (i) and (iii) enable development to be permitted where benefits outweigh harm or the harm is minimised, mitigated or compensated.

With regard to policy EN2 (Landscape Protection), WDH considers that this policy should be removed in its entirety as it conflicts with the requirements of the NPPF. Whilst WDH does acknowledge that developments should be sensitively designed to mitigate harm to landscape character, visual impact and heritage assets as required by national policy, the proposed wording of this policy is onerous and unjustified.

Draft policy EN5 (Canopy Cover) requires all major development to increase post-development canopy cover to at least 20% of the site area. Where canopy cover exceeds 20% before development, the proposal should ensure retention of at least the existing level of canopy cover. The justification for the policy seems to be provided within paragraph 5.18 of the plan which states that Rugby Borough is in the bottom 20% of English authorities for woodland cover according to a 2023 Friends of the Earth estimate.

Whilst WDH is supportive of the provision of trees as part of the development of their sites, this policy would not promote the effective use of land in meeting the need for homes and other uses, thus conflicting with paragraph 124 of the NPPF. The implications of this policy could be very significant for the viability of development sites and would be very difficult to deliver as it is at odds with other plan policies which seek the delivery of specific housing numbers, density, the provision of public open space, renewable energy, biodiversity net gain and sustainable drainage facilities, not all of which are compatible with the provision of trees. Whilst paragraph 5.16 recognises that there may be sites for which achieving 20% canopy cover is not possible or desirable and that in such circumstances an alternative level of provision will be negotiated, this is supporting text and does not form part of the wording of the policy.

WDH considers that policy EN5 should be deleted on the grounds that it is not justified by national policy, it is not grounded in any credible evidence base and its implications are likely to have significant viability considerations. If Rugby Borough Council wishes to increase the quantum of woodland in the borough, then it should identify suitable sites and allocate land for such purposes within the local plan.

If RBC is minded to retain the policy and can justify the provision through robust evidence, WDH suggests the following amendment:

A. The Council will seek for all major development, excluding development in Rugby town centre, to increase the post-development canopy cover [to at least 20% of the site area - DELETE TEXT] (excluding areas of the site that are high or very high distinctiveness habitats). This will be considered on a site-by-site basis having regard to the development objectives for the site and other local plan policies, [with overall need informed by up-to-date evidence which identifies the percentage of canopy cover which should be achieved for each settlement - DELETE TEXT].

B. Where the canopy cover of the site exceeds 20% the specified percentage of canopy cover which needs to be achieved for

Questionnaire on Rugby's Preferred Options Consultation Document

[B. where the canopy cover of the site exceeds 20% the specified percentage of canopy cover which needs to be achieved for each settlement (as required by Criterion A) before development, the proposal should ensure retention of at least the existing level of canopy cover - DELETE TEXT]

C. In meeting the requirements of this policy, existing canopy should be retained first, before considering new planting.

D. Within Rugby town centre (as defined on the policies map) development shall maximise opportunities for canopy cover and other green infrastructure including green roofs.

Page 9: Housing

Q19

Agree

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

Q20

What are the reasons for your answer to question 19?

Housing Mix

Draft policy H1 (Housing Mix) requires new housing developments to contribute to meeting the housing needs of the borough as identified in the latest Housing and Economic Development Needs Assessment (HEDNA) and any other appropriate local evidence. Paragraph 6.1 identifies a mix of different dwelling sizes by tenure that is needed across the borough based on the 2022 HEDNA, as follows:

	1 bed	2 bed	3 bed	4+ bed
Market housing	10%	30%	45%	15%
Affordable home ownership	20%	40%	30%	10%
Social rent	35%	30%	20%	15%

Furthermore, part B of the policy sets out that major development is required to provide a range of homes. WDH supports the principle of this policy as it ensures that a range of homes can be provided with overall mix to be determined by the HEDNA and local evidence to ensure that the needs of local areas is accommodated.

Affordable Housing

Draft policy H2A (Affordable Housing) requires major development sites outside of the Rugby urban area to provide 30% affordable housing. This level of provision is supported, however, should be considered on a site by site basis and subject to viability.

Draft policy H2B requires affordable housing to be provided, in the ratio of 82% social rent to 18% affordable home ownership. Whilst these percentages derive from the 2022 HEDNA and are evidence based, if the HEDNA is updated in the future then the specified percentages will be out of date. Additionally, the HEDNA refers to social/affordable rent and does not exclusively investigate the need for social rent. WDH thus recommends that policy H2 should reflect this position if the HEDNA is to be used as evidence to support the policy.

2.54 WDH therefore suggests that draft policy H2 is reworded as follows:

"H2 Affordable housing

A. Developments that result in ten or more new homes (including conversions and subdivisions) shall, subject to viability considerations, provide [at least - DELETE TEXT] the following proportion of new homes as affordable homes:

- i. Within the Rugby urban area: 20%
- ii. Elsewhere in the borough: 30%

B. The Council will consider proposals on a site by site basis. Subject to viability and unless the latest HEDNA indicates otherwise, the tenure mix of affordable homes should be as follows:

- i. Social rent 82%
- ii. Affordable home ownership 18%

C. Development shall integrate affordable housing and market housing to achieve an inclusive and mixed community.

D. Affordable housing should be provided on-site unless off-site provision or a financial contribution calculated in accordance with paragraph E can be justified. For developments of build to rent homes an off-site financial contribution will be accepted.

E. Off-site financial contributions will be calculated based on the build cost plus the land cost of the affordable homes minus the value that a registered provider would pay for those homes".

Housing for Different Groups

Questionnaire on Rugby's Preferred Options Consultation Document

Housing for Different Groups

Draft policy H6C (Specialist Housing) requires the housing allocation to the south of Rugby Road, Brinklow to make provision for serviced self-build and/or custom build plots as part of the development. However, the policy fails to specify how many self-build and/or custom build plots should be provided and is not evidence based given that the council's self-build register indicates that there is only demand for one self build plot in Brinklow.

If self-build and custom-build policy is to be retained by RBC, the policy requires flexibility

WDH considers that policy H6C needs to be amended by removing the need for the land south of Rugby Road, Brinklow to accommodate self-build and/or custom build plots.

Policy H7 requires 100% of new homes to comply with M4(2) of the Building Regulations regarding the provision of accessible and adaptable dwellings, and 10% of dwellings to comply with M4(3) which deals with wheelchair user dwellings. Additionally, policy H7 specifies minimum garden sizes.

WDH acknowledges that paragraph 14.65 of the 2022 HEDNA identifies that councils should seek, "a proportion (around 10-15%) of all new market homes to be M4(3) compliant", to meet the Borough's ageing population, so this element of the policy is evidence-based and justified.

However, paragraph 14.66 of the HEDNA recognises that with regard to M4(2) homes, "it may not be possible for some schemes to be built to these higher standards due to built form, topography, flooding etc. Furthermore, provision of this type of property may, in some cases, challenge the viability of delivery given the reasonably high build costs". Although paragraph 14.74 of the HEDNA asserts that there is a "clear need" to increase the supply of accessible and adaptable dwellings and wheelchair user dwellings as well as providing specific provision of older persons housing, it also states that councils "could consider (as a start point)", requiring all dwellings (in all tenures) to meet the M4(2) standards (which are similar to the Lifetime Homes Standards) and 10%+ of homes meeting M4(3) wheelchair user dwellings (a higher proportion in the affordable sector)". There is therefore no sound evidence base which demonstrates that all new dwellings need to meet the M4(2) standards and the policy should be amended.

The provision of 100% of new homes in accordance with M4(2) standards is excessive and will create significant viability considerations for developers and the council. WDH therefore strongly encourages Rugby Borough Council to avoid placing unnecessary restrictions on new development by requiring all new houses to meet the M4(2) requirement, and instead to pursue a policy whereby the number of houses built to M4(2) standards is maximised. This will provide developers with flexibility to take into account individual site conditions as well as viability issues.

Finally, WDH objects to policy H7 specifying minimum garden sizes on the grounds that (a) there is no policy basis for such provision within the National Planning Policy Framework, (b) such a policy will inhibit the requirement for planning authorities and developers to make effective use of land, (c) such a policy could adversely affect the viability of developments and (d) the policy could inhibit compliance with policy D1B of the draft local plan which requires all development to respond appropriately to context and character in its build form, layout, orientation and density/grain. WDH considers that policy H7 should therefore be reworded as follows:

"H7 Housing standards

- A. All new dwellings shall, as a minimum, meet the Nationally Described Space Standards.
- B. [All new dwellings shall meet the requirements for Category 2 accessible and adaptable dwellings set out in Part M4(2) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended) - DELETE TEXT]. All new developments should seek to maximise the number of accessible and adaptable dwellings provided, as set out in Part M4(2) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulations 2010 (as amended), taking into account site specific and viability considerations
- C. On developments of 10 or more homes, ten per cent of dwellings shall meet the requirements for Category 3 wheelchair user dwellings set out in Part M4(3) of Schedule 1 to the Building Regulation 2010 (as amended).
- [D. For houses, a rear or side garden shall be provided of at least 7 metres in depth and of at least the following sizes:
 - i. for a 2 bedroom house 60m²;
 - ii. for a 3 bedroom or larger house 80m²
- E. For apartments and houses in multiple occupation a minimum of 5m² of private outdoor space must be provided per bedroom -

DELETE TEXT]

Page 10: Wellbeing

Q21

No Answer

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

Q22

What are the reasons for your answer to question 21?

No comment.

Page 11: Design

Q23

No Answer

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

Q24

What are the reasons for your answer to question 23?

No comment.

Page 12: Infrastructure

Q25

Disagree

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

Q26

What are the reasons for your answer to question 25?

Paragraph 58 of the NPPF is very clear that planning obligations must only be sought where they meet all of the following tests:

- a) necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms
- b) directly related to the development, and
- c) fairly and reasonably related in scale and kind to the development.

However, criterion (B) of Policy I4 states that "planning obligations may include retrospective contributions towards infrastructure improvements which have been fully or partly delivered at the date the relevant obligation is entered into, but which deliver necessary mitigation for the proposed development".

As currently worded, policy I4 would allow Rugby Borough Council and/or Warwickshire County Council to recoup a financial contribution towards historical education or highways provision. Whilst it is wholly appropriate for a developer to mitigate the impacts of a proposed development compared to the baseline position when a planning permission is granted, infrastructure that exists at the time when the baseline position is calculated is clearly not necessary to make the proposed development acceptable in planning terms and is not directly related to the proposed development. Criterion B does not accord with the requirements of national planning policy and is therefore unsound. WDH considers that criterion (B) should be deleted.

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:

No comment.

Page 14: About you

Q28

What is your name?

████████████████████

Q29

What organisation are you representing, if applicable?

████████████████

Q30

Other

Are you a resident of Rugby Borough?

Q31

Your contact email

████████████████████

Q32

Your contact address

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

Q33

Your Postcode

[REDACTED]

Q34

What is your Gender Identity?

[REDACTED]

Q35

Age

[REDACTED]

Q36

Ethnicity

[REDACTED]

Q37

Do you consider yourself to be disabled?

[REDACTED]

Q38

What is your sexual orientation?

[REDACTED]

Q39

What is your religion or belief?

[REDACTED]
