

## 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\*

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

*\*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.*

Title	Mr	
First Name	Damian	
Last Name	Keogh	
Job Title (where relevant)		
Organisation (where relevant)		
Address Line 1		
Line 2		
Line 3		
Line 4		
Post Code		
Telephone Number		
E-mail Address		

(where relevant)

## 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?

Local Plan Paragraph		Local Plan Policy	Housing Allocations – Wolvey	Policies Map	Allocation of: Site 358 – Land at Coventry Road, Wolvey (approx. 60 dwellings) Site 309 – Land north of B4109, Wolvey (approx. 150 dwellings)
Site ID					

4. Do you consider the Local Plan:

(1) is Legally compliant	Yes		No	X
(2) is Sound	Yes		No	X
(3) complies with the Duty to co-operate	Yes		No	X

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.

This representation formally objects to the allocation of Site 358 (Land at Coventry Road, Wolvey) and Site 309 (Land north of the B4109, Wolvey) on the grounds that the Proposed Submission Local Plan does not satisfy the statutory requirements for legal compliance and fails the tests of soundness prescribed by section 20(5) of the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004.

In particular, the allocations do not demonstrate that the Plan has been positively prepared, is justified, is effective, or is consistent with national policy, as required by paragraph 35 of the National Planning Policy Framework (December 2023).

It is respectfully submitted that the cumulative scale and spatial impact of these allocations, when assessed against the evidence base and national policy framework, result in a strategy that is disproportionate to the role, function and infrastructure capacity of Wolvey as a rural settlement, and therefore cannot be found sound at examination.

## **A Legal Compliance**

### **1 Sustainability Appraisal / SEA**

Pursuant to sections 19(5) and 39 of the 2004 Act and the Environmental Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004, the Council is required to undertake a lawful Sustainability Appraisal incorporating SEA.

The Sustainability Appraisal does not demonstrate a sufficiently robust assessment of:

- Cumulative impacts of allocating both sites concurrently
- Landscape sensitivity and settlement edge harm
- Green Belt purposes (NPPF paras 140–147)
- Traffic generation and rural highway capacity
- Infrastructure thresholds in a small rural settlement.

The SA appears to assess sites individually without adequately addressing their combined urbanising effect. This constitutes a failure to properly evaluate reasonable alternatives, contrary to Regulation 12.

### **2 Duty to Co-operate**

Section 33A of the 2004 Act requires active and ongoing engagement on strategic matters.

Given Wolvey's proximity to the Coventry urban edge and strategic growth corridors, there is insufficient evidence that:

- Cross-boundary traffic displacement impacts have been resolved.
- Public transport network enhancements are secured through joint infrastructure planning.
- Strategic housing redistribution from adjacent authorities has been transparently assessed.

The absence of demonstrable outcomes renders compliance with the Duty to Co-operate questionable.

## **B. Soundness – NPPF Paragraph 35**

The Plan is not:

- Justified
- Effective
- Consistent with national policy

### **1 Not Justified**

Paragraph 35(b) requires a Plan to be based on proportionate evidence and to represent the most appropriate strategy when considered against reasonable alternatives.

Disproportionate Growth

The allocation of approximately 210 dwellings in Wolvey represents a material percentage increase in the village housing stock. Such quantum exceeds what could reasonably be described as incremental rural growth.

No compelling evidence demonstrates:

- Why smaller, dispersed allocations were discounted.
- Why brownfield land capacity is exhausted.
- Why Wolvey's infrastructure capacity supports this scale.

The strategy appears driven by numerical distribution rather than a place-based capacity assessment.

#### Green Belt Harm

NPPF paragraphs 140–147 require exceptional circumstances to justify Green Belt boundary alteration.

- The allocations:
- Extend development into open countryside.
- Weaken defensible boundaries.
- Risk incremental sprawl toward the Coventry fringe.
- Conflict with Green Belt purposes, particularly preventing urban sprawl and safeguarding countryside from encroachment.

Exceptional circumstances specific to Wolvey have not been clearly evidenced.

#### **2 Not Effective**

Paragraph 35(c) requires deliverability over the plan period and effective joint working.

#### **Highway Impacts**

The B4109 is already subject to congestion at peak times. The cumulative impact of 210 dwellings has not been transparently modelled in a way that demonstrates safe and free-flowing operation.

Without detailed junction modelling, secured mitigation and phased delivery triggers, the allocations lack deliverability certainty.

#### **Public Transport**

The requirement for "financial contributions" to improve services does not equate to secured service enhancement.

In the absence of binding service level agreements, residents will remain car-dependent, contrary to NPPF paragraphs 108–113 promoting sustainable transport.

#### **Community Infrastructure**

There is insufficient evidence confirming:

- Deliverable primary school expansion capacity.
- GP surgery capacity enhancement.
- Drainage and surface water mitigation infrastructure.

Infrastructure must be demonstrably funded, phased and viable. Aspirational mitigation does not satisfy effectiveness.

### **3 Not Consistent with National Policy Character and Beauty of the Countryside**

NPPF paragraph 180 requires recognition of the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside.

The southern landscape buffer proposed at Site 358 implicitly acknowledges landscape sensitivity. However, mitigation does not negate the fundamental urbanisation of currently open land forming the rural approach to Wolvey.

#### **Settlement Identity**

The combined allocations extend development in multiple directions, materially altering the village envelope and eroding its distinct identity.

The cumulative impact conflicts with the objective of creating well-designed places (NPPF para 131) and protecting valued landscapes.

#### **C. Cumulative Impact**

The Inspector is respectfully invited to consider the combined effect of Sites 358 and 309.

Individually moderate allocations become materially harmful when considered cumulatively, resulting in:

- Significant traffic uplift.
- Compounded infrastructure pressure.
- Visual and landscape harm.
- Long-term settlement creep.

The cumulative urbanising effect is not proportionate to Wolvey's role within the settlement hierarchy

#### **D. Personal Context (Material Planning Consideration)**

As residents of Wolvey, we support proportionate, sustainable growth. However, this scale of development would fundamentally and irrevocably alter the character, setting and functioning of our village.

Wolvey's value lies in:

- Its rural identity.
- Its cohesive community.
- Its landscape setting.
- Its manageable scale.

The Plan does not achieve a fair or sustainable balance between housing delivery and environmental stewardship.

(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.

**Main Modification 1**

Removal of Site 309 – Land North of B4109, Wolvey

Modification Required:

Delete Site 309 in its entirety from the Policies Map and all associated policy text.

Reason:

The allocation is not justified, effective, nor consistent with national policy due to:

- Disproportionate scale relative to Wolvey’s settlement hierarchy status
- Insufficient evidence of deliverable highway mitigation on the B4109
- Cumulative infrastructure pressure when assessed alongside Site 358
- Landscape and countryside encroachment harm contrary to NPPF paragraph 180
- Inadequate demonstration of exceptional circumstances insofar as Green Belt release is concerned (NPPF paragraphs 140–147).

Removal of this allocation would restore proportionality to the spatial strategy and ensure the Plan is justified and consistent with national policy.

**Main Modification 2**

Reduction in Quantum of Development at Site 358 – Land at Coventry Road

Modification Required:

Amend the allocation to reduce the indicative dwelling capacity from approximately 60 dwellings to a materially lower figure reflecting incremental rural growth (for example, 25–30 dwellings maximum), subject to landscape-led master planning.

Site 358 – Land at Coventry Road, Wolvey is allocated for residential development of approximately 25–30 dwellings, subject to a landscape-led design approach which:

- Preserves the rural character of the settlement edge.
- Retains open countryside views.
- Provides substantial structural planting to reinforce a permanent and defensible Green Belt boundary.
- Demonstrates that development will not result in severe highway impacts.

Reason:

A reduced quantum would:

- ✓ Align growth with Wolvey's infrastructure capacity.
- ✓ Mitigate cumulative traffic generation.
- ✓ Reduce landscape and settlement edge harm.
- ✓ Ensure compliance with NPPF paragraphs 108–113 (transport), 131 (design), and 180 (countryside character).

This modification is necessary for the Plan to be justified and effective.

### **Main Modification 3**

Insertion of a Cumulative Infrastructure Safeguard Policy for Wolvey

Modification Required:

Insert a specific policy requirement stating that occupation of dwellings at Wolvey shall be phased and contingent upon demonstrated infrastructure capacity. Development at Wolvey shall be phased in accordance with a comprehensive Infrastructure Delivery Plan. No occupation shall occur unless:

Highway mitigation measures identified through cumulative modelling are implemented.

Primary school capacity is demonstrably available or expanded.

Drainage and surface water infrastructure is delivered and operational.

Public transport enhancements are secured through binding agreements.

Reason:

The current wording relies heavily on financial contributions without guaranteed delivery. This renders the Plan ineffective under paragraph 35(c) of the NPPF.

Phasing safeguards are necessary to ensure development is deliverable and infrastructure led.

### **Main Modification 4**

Strengthened Green Belt Exceptional Circumstances Justification

Modification Required:

Insert explicit, settlement-specific justification explaining:

- Why Wolvey is required to accommodate growth.
- Why alternative non-Green Belt sites were discounted.
- How the revised boundaries will be permanent and defensible beyond the plan period.

Reason:

NPPF paragraph 143 requires exceptional circumstances to be fully evidenced and justified. The current evidence base does not sufficiently demonstrate why release at Wolvey is necessary in preference to alternative strategies.

Without strengthened justification, the Plan is not legally robust nor consistent with national policy.

**Main Modification 5**

Requirement for Comprehensive Cumulative Transport Assessment

Modification Required:

Amend policy wording to require cumulative junction modelling of Sites 358 and 309 (if retained), including sensitivity testing for peak hour flows and committed development.

Prior to determination of any planning application, a cumulative Transport Assessment shall be submitted demonstrating that the combined impact of allocated development will not result in severe residual cumulative impacts on the local or strategic road network

Reason:

NPPF paragraph 111 states that development should only be refused on highways grounds where residual cumulative impacts are severe. The Plan must demonstrate at allocation stage that this threshold will not be breached. Without this evidence, the allocation is not effective nor justified.

(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.**

7. If your representation is seeking a modification to the plan, do you consider it necessary to participate in examination hearing session(s)?

**No**, I do not wish to participate in hearing session(s)

**Yes**, I wish to participate in hearing session(s)

Please note that while this will provide an initial indication of your wish to participate in hearing session(s), you may be asked at a later point to confirm your request to participate.

8. If you wish to participate in the hearing session(s), please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

---

Given the scale of proposed development and the cumulative impacts identified, it is necessary to participate in hearing sessions to:

- Elaborate on infrastructure and cumulative harm concerns.
- Respond to the Council's evidence base.
- Assist the Inspector in determining whether the Plan meets the statutory tests of soundness.

The issues raised are strategic in nature and warrant oral examination.

**Please note** the Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate in hearing session(s). You may be asked to confirm your wish to participate when the Inspector has identified the matters and issues for examination.

9. If you have used AI to produce or substantially alter your representation, please declare which tool you have used, how it was used, and what checks you have undertaken to ensure the AI-produced material is accurate.

All representations received will be submitted to the Planning Inspectorate alongside the Proposed Submission Local Plan and published on the council's website. Personal addresses and email addresses (as distinct from businesses addresses), but not names, will be redacted before representations are published.

The Rugby Borough Council Privacy Notice for Development Strategy is available here:

<https://www.rugby.gov.uk/w/privacy#development-strategy>

The Planning Inspectorate's privacy notice can be accessed here:

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/planning-inspectorate-privacy-notice>