

## Representation Form for Local Plans



### Local Plan Publication Stage Representation Form

Ref:

(For  
official  
use only)

**Name of the Local Plan to which  
this representation relates:**

Rugby Borough Council Proposed  
Submission Local Plan

**Please return to Rugby Borough Council by 5:00pm Friday 13<sup>th</sup> March 2026**  
**By email to:** [localplan@rugby.gov.uk](mailto:localplan@rugby.gov.uk) with **Proposed Submission Consultation**  
**in the subject line, OR by post to:** Development Strategy, Town Hall, Evreux  
Way, Rugby, CV21 2RR.

This form has two parts –

Part A – Personal Details: need only be completed once.

Part B – Your representation(s). Please fill in a separate sheet for each  
representation you wish to make.

### Part A

#### 1. Personal Details\*

*\*If an agent is appointed, please complete only the Title, Name and Organisation boxes below (if applicable) but complete the full contact details of the agent in 2.*

#### 2. Agent's Details (if applicable)

Title	<input type="text" value="Mrs"/>	<input type="text"/>
First Name	<input type="text" value="Sarah"/>	<input type="text"/>
Last Name	<input type="text" value="Ascroft"/>	<input type="text"/>
Job Title (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Organisation (where relevant)	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Address Line 1	<input type="text" value="██████████"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 2	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 3	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Line 4	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
Post Code	<input type="text" value="██████"/>	<input type="text"/>
Telephone Number	<input type="text"/>	<input type="text"/>
E-mail Address (where relevant)	<input type="text" value="██████████"/>	<input type="text"/>

## Part B – Please use a separate sheet for each policy or site you wish to comment on

Name or Organisation:

3. To which part of the Local Plan does this representation relate?

Paragraph	<input type="text"/>	Policy	S1 Settlement Hierarchy  Relevant to: Policy S6 Residential allocations (Brinklow)	Policies Map	<input type="text"/>
Site ID	<input type="text"/>				

4. Do you consider the Local Plan:

(1) is Legally compliant	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(2) is Sound	Yes	<input type="text"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
(3) complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="text"/>

5. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty to co-operate. Please be as precise as possible.

If you wish to support the legal compliance or soundness of the Local Plan or its compliance with the duty to co-operate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

### 1. Summary of Objection

This representation objects to the classification of **Brinklow as a Main Rural Settlement** under Policy S1 and the consequential allocation of approximately 325 dwellings under Policy S6.

The designation is:

- Not justified
- Not effective
- Not consistent with national policy
- Not positively prepared
- Potentially not legally compliant in relation to statutory heritage duties

The classification materially misrepresents Brinklow's infrastructure capacity, service provision and sustainability profile.

## 2. Conflict with the Made Brinklow Neighbourhood Plan (2022)

The Brinklow Neighbourhood Plan (Made November 2022) forms part of the statutory Development Plan under s38(6) Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

It describes Brinklow as:

“small and rural... Growth will be limited and controlled to maintain this size and character.”

Brinklow\_Neighbourhood\_Plan\_\_ad...

It identifies support for:

- Limited infill
- Proportionate development
- Protection of Green Belt
- Protection of ridge and furrow
- Heritage preservation

It does **not** identify Brinklow as a strategic rural service centre.

The Plan description of facilities refers to a “**school annex**” rather than a primary school

Brinklow\_Neighbourhood\_Plan\_\_ad...

No material change in circumstances since 2022 has been demonstrated that would justify overriding the Neighbourhood Plan’s spatial strategy. The Proposed Local Plan therefore fails the **justified** test and conflicts with national policy support for neighbourhood planning (NPPF paras 28–30).

## 3. Brinklow Does Not Meet the Definition of a Main Rural Settlement

Policy S1 states Main Rural Settlements are those with the greatest range of services and facilities.

Brinklow:

- Has no primary school.
- Nearest primary approx. 3.5 miles away.
- Nearest secondary approx. 6.5 miles away.
- No realistic walking or cycling access to either.
- Limited and unreliable public transport.
- Nearest supermarket and petrol station approx. 4 miles away.
- Nearest rail station approx. 6.5 miles away.

This level of provision does not constitute a sustainable rural service centre.

The classification appears to have been carried forward from previous plan periods rather than reassessed against current infrastructure conditions.

The Plan is therefore **not justified by proportionate and up-to-date evidence** (NPPF para 35).

## 4. Housing Type and Infrastructure Misalignment

The Local Plan identifies need for:

- Family housing
- Affordable housing
- Older persons accommodation

The Neighbourhood Plan Housing Needs Survey also identified elderly housing need

Brinklow\_Neighbourhood\_Plan\_\_ad...

However:

- Family housing requires accessible primary and secondary education.
- Elderly housing requires safe pedestrian access to healthcare.

Brinklow:

- Has no primary school.
- Secondary school is 6.5 miles distant.
- GP surgery is accessed via a narrow rural road with no continuous footpath.
- GP is operating at capacity.
- No secured expansion provision identified.

This creates structural car dependency for daily needs, contrary to NPPF paras 108–113 (sustainable transport).

The strategy is therefore **not effective**.

## **5. Transport and Safety Evidence**

The Brinklow Traffic Survey identifies:

- 66% of vehicles exceeding speed limit on Coventry Road
- 65% exceeding speed limit on Rugby Road
- 84% exceeding speed limit on Lutterworth Road

Brinklow\_Neighbourhood\_Plan\_\_ad...

The Strategic Transport Assessment does not demonstrate that development of this scale can be accommodated without material harm to highway safety or increased congestion

Strategic Transport Assessment ...

.

This conflicts with NPPF para 115 (safe and suitable access).

## **6. Green Belt and Proportionality**

Brinklow lies entirely within the Green Belt.

The previous Local Plan Inspector (Mike Hayden) concluded that a 100-dwelling proposal at Brinklow would:

“cause harm to the openness and purposes of the Green Belt and to the character of the countryside.”

The current proposal allocates a substantially greater quantum.

Even if borough-wide Exceptional Circumstances are accepted, site selection and distribution must still be justified and proportionate (NPPF paras 140–143).

Brinklow:

- Does not function as a sustainable rural hub.
- Contains significant heritage constraints.
- Has infrastructure limitations.

- Has an adopted Neighbourhood Plan supporting limited growth. The allocation is not the most appropriate strategy when reasonable alternatives exist.

## 7. Heritage – Statutory Duty

Brinklow contains:

- A Scheduled Ancient Monument.
- A Conservation Area.
- 26 listed buildings

Brinklow\_Neighbourhood\_Plan\_\_ad...

.

Under:

- Section 66(1) Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act 1990
- Section 72(1) of the same Act

Decision-makers must give “**considerable importance and weight**” to preserving listed buildings and Conservation Areas.

The Court of Appeal in *Barnwell Manor Wind Energy Ltd v East Northamptonshire DC* [2014] EWCA Civ 137 confirmed this duty is a matter of law and must carry substantial weight.

The scale of allocation materially alters the rural setting of these assets.

The Plan does not demonstrate that the statutory duty has been properly discharged at the strategic allocation stage.

The Plan is therefore potentially not legally compliant.

## 8. Infrastructure-Led Growth Failure

The Neighbourhood Plan states:

“New development should be supported by the timely delivery of infrastructure, services and facilities.”

Brinklow\_Neighbourhood\_Plan\_\_ad...

No secured commitments exist for:

- School provision in the village.
- GP expansion.
- Sewer capacity upgrades.
- Public transport improvements.

Growth is therefore not infrastructure-led and fails the positively prepared test.

## 9. Soundness Conclusion

The classification of Brinklow as a Main Rural Settlement fails the tests of soundness:

- **Not positively prepared** – infrastructure not aligned.
- **Not justified** – sustainability evidence does not support designation.
- **Not effective** – no deliverable mitigation for key constraints.
- **Not consistent with national policy** – conflicts with Green Belt, heritage and sustainable transport policy.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

6. Please set out the modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant and sound, in respect of any legal compliance or soundness matters you have identified at 5 above. (Please note that non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why each modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

To make the Plan sound:

1. Reclassify Brinklow as a **Rural Village** under Policy S1.
2. Remove or significantly reduce allocations under Policy S6.
3. Align growth with the Brinklow Neighbourhood Plan (2022).
4. Reassess Green Belt release at Brinklow based on sustainability and heritage sensitivity.

(Continue on a separate sheet /expand box if necessary)

**Please note:** In your representation you should provide succinctly all the evidence and supporting information necessary to support your representation and your suggested modification(s). You should not assume that you will have a further opportunity to make submissions.

**After this stage, further submissions may only be made if invited by the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he or she identifies for examination.**

