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 13th March 2026 By email to: 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)
Title	Mr	Mrs
First Name	Andrew	Karen
Last Name	Robertson	Robertson
Job Title	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]		
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]		
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

**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.*

(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	CL2	Local Plan Policy	Proposed Submission Local Plan 2025-2042	Policies Map	Proposed Submission Policies Map, Development Strategy, containing 'Area Suitable for Wind Turbine Development
Site ID					

4. Do you consider the Local Plan:

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

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.

My wife and I and **58** of our neighbours and residents of the Redrow estate at Houlton, who have received copies of, have viewed and are in full agreement with our representation statement (see accompanying attachment to our email which lists these residents of Houlton and provides their addresses, email addresses and phone numbers) - meaning that this is a joint representation, as requested by the guidelines for making representations that collective representations may be made - are very alarmed and uncomfortable about the prospect of the potential installation of wind turbines on fields in front of our homes between Houlton and Clifton upon Dunsmore, and think it is **UNSOUND**. This is not because we are against green energy generated by wind turbines. It is to do with the potential siting of wind turbines on the proposed site, for all the reasons stated in CL2, in EN1, EN2, EN8 and D4 of the 'Proposed Rugby Local Plan 2025-2042, Proposed Submission Version January 2026', with additional comment on the historical value of the land from the 'Sustainability Appraisal (SA) document of the Rugby Borough Council Local Plan', and because the potential siting of the wind turbines here is also inconsistent with Section 15 of the National Planning Policy Framework. These will be expanded upon below, in turn, for your kind consideration.

CL2 C (p.24 of the Local Plan) states that 'Wind turbine development will, subject to compliance with other policies of this plan, be permitted within the areas shown as suitable on the policies map'. On the same page, under 2.5, it states that 'Renewable energy development proposals will be considered against other relevant policies of this plan', and then lists these (EN1, EN2, EN8 and D4). We submit to you that each one of these points presents a totally valid reason why wind turbines should **not** be sited here, as follows:

EN1 (Biodiversity and geodiversity protection) (Page 38 of the Plan): point C of this states that there should be no harm to or loss of a local wildlife site or nature reserve. We as residents know that the

proposed site for the wind turbines is precisely where a wide range of birds and fowls are currently enjoying being and settling, such as ducks, swans, herons, sparrow hawks, owls, swifts, starlings and a variety of geese. These not only fly over, but land in this area, not only on the area in front of the Redrow houses, but also in the fields adjacent to that space where we understand that the wind turbines would be situated. Some may also nest in these fields or in hedges or trees bordering them. We understand that there are newts which are protected, in the field directly in front of us and it is also possible that there are bats, because they have been seen flying in one of our neighbour's gardens, which may be of a specific, protected species. We have also seen deer in the farmland fields. Siting the wind turbines in these fields and their operation could threaten this beautiful wildlife which we as residents, see exists here. Hence this plan is counter to EN1.

EN2 Landscape Protection (page 39 of the Plan): this is probably the main objection that we have to the potential siting of wind turbines in these fields. EN2 Part A states that plans should avoid significant adverse impacts on landscape character and significant adverse visual impacts. Part B states that the development proposals must be located and designed to respect scenic quality and maintain a distinctive character sense of place and Part C that the proposals must avoid detrimental impacts on landscape features which 'make a significant contribution to the character of the area'. There are precious few, green, genuinely rural spaces in Houlton, especially in this particular area, which residents can go to, walk in or by, view and enjoy, contributing to their mental and overall well-being. The area of proposed development of wind turbines is a beautiful space, which residents here and from other parts of Houlton can see as they walk on the path from Houlton Way, towards the A5, and drink in the views of rural farmland, empty skies, bird and wildlife as mentioned above, and be refreshed by this rare aspect of a rural scene in Houlton. Siting wind turbines here would contradict EN2 substantially and detrimentally diminish one of the remaining rural sites of beauty on the Houlton development and its effect of providing us with a sense of overall well-being, introducing instead a further feeling of urbanisation (we understand that only about 1,600 houses have been built so far and a further c. 4,700 are to be built, which will cover most of the fields behind us up to the Dollman Farm area) and industrialisation in a harmful way to us as residents in the Houlton development.

EN8 Environmental Protection and Amenity (page 45 of the Plan): The siting of wind turbines on farmland fields near our houses is countered by EN 8. Part A of this states that any development will not cause or be affected by unacceptable harm to human life…through such things as 'noise', 'light pollution', or 'vibration'. Wind turbines can cause noise to household residents, disturbing sleep patterns at night, with their whirring noise. Their red lights could also produce unacceptable light at night-time, again disturbing the sleep of local residents. Part B and 5.26 refer to developments not having an unacceptable impact on the amenity of existing or proposed users or occupants of neighbouring buildings or land and shall provide adequate amenity for occupants and users of the proposed development, in relation to among other things, 'privacy', and 'avoiding an overbearing impact'. The wind turbines would definitely encroach upon our privacy and have an 'overbearing impact' on us. The dictionary definition of 'amenity' is 'something that makes life more comfortable and pleasant for people' (Cambridge English Dictionary Online, accessed on 04/03/2026). Siting wind turbines here will substantially decrease the amenity of this pleasant, rare rural green space that Houlton residents currently enjoy and hence we are opposed to the siting, in line with EN8.

D4 Historic Environment (page 65 of the Plan) Part A states that National policy and legislation will be applied to the consideration of development proposals which have potential to affect the significance of a heritage asset and its setting. In the 'Sustainability Appraisal (SA) of Rugby Borough Council Local Plan, December 2025', pages 72-73, reference is made to: 'Also significant is the historic sensitivity in respect of north Houlton', going on to state that the Heritage Impact Assessment (HIA) explains that there could be a loss or erosion of the 'set piece view' and/or the contributions of its wider rural setting, including Clifton Court…. 'Incongruous features could be introduced to views'…. 'creating further distractions to the panoramic viewpoint'. While these comments *may* not (although they may do so) relate directly to the potential wind turbine development site, the geographical proximity to the potential wind turbines to the area referred to and sentiment expressed within them, do relate to this potential development. Clifton Court is part of the view that residents in the Redrow homes enjoy when walking along the path near to the fields. Placing wind turbines in fields, which would cut across our panoramic view to a site with a historical heritage, adds another reason why the wind turbines should not be placed where they are proposed to be situated.

Our objections are also consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, Section 15, 'Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment', such as:

Paragraph 187: 'Planning policies and decisions should contribute to and enhance the natural and local environment by:

a) 'protecting and enhancing valued landscapes (and) sites of biodiversity'….
b) 'recognising the intrinsic character and beauty of the countryside….and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land'.

The proposed wind turbine development on this beautiful, farmland and countryside place is counter to the above, as discussed above under EN2 on the protection of landscape.

Paragraph 188: 'Plans should…allocate land with the least environmental or amenity value' – we argue that the plans to site wind turbines on the farmland is directly counter to this (EN8).

Paragraph 192 concerning biodiversity states that plans should a) 'identify, map and safeguard components of wildlife-rich habitats…and b) 'promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats…and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity'. As mentioned above, under EN1, the area for the proposed development site is one of rich biodiversity which the wind turbines would threaten.

Summary & Conclusion: we as residents object to the potential siting of wind turbines in farmland fields in front of our homes because we see it as **unsound**, for all the reasons stated above, which are objections consistent and totally in line with points from the Rugby Borough Local Plan (EN1, EN2, EN8 and D4) and because it counters the National Planning Policy Framework 2024, Section 15, 'Conserving and Enhancing the Natural Environment'.

We are not asking for this potential development to be modified on the proposed site. We are requesting that it does not proceed here, at all. While we are for green energy, part of which may be produced by wind turbines, we think that the more appropriate siting of wind turbines is near to industrial warehouses, such as the case on the A5 area. For this reason, the modification we would accept would be siting the wind turbines in another area, where there are warehouses and industry. We understand that no other residential area in Rugby has been identified for wind turbine development. We struggle to see why we have been singled out and we argue that the potential wind turbine development on this site, would result in the area suffering the adverse biodiversity effects to wildlife, above all that we as Houlton residents will suffer loss of one of the main, rural and green farmland, amenity, quiet and beautiful spaces in Houlton, as well as environmental pollution issues such as noise and an overbearing impact and intrusion into our private, residential space, right in front of our homes.

Please hear our plea and do not proceed with this unsound development!

Thank you for considering our case.

Yours faithfully

Andrew and Karen Robertson and 58 other residents of Houlton.

(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.

We are asking for this planned development in this particular location not to proceed at all because it is too unsound, for all the reasons given above, concerning the effects on the environment. We would be open to a modified plan that involved siting wind turbines not here but elsewhere in Rugby, near to warehouses or industrial areas.

(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)	X	**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:

If it is deemed not to proceed with this development, we see no need to be present at a hearing; only if the plan is set to proceed, then we would like the right to publicly voice our objections.

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.

Not applicable

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-notices

WIND TURBINES – LIST OF PEOPLE ON THIS JOINT REPRESENTATION AGAINST WIND TURBINES ON FARMLAND FIELDS IN HOULTON - CL2 OF THE PROPOSED RUGBY LOCAL PLAN 2025-2042, PROPOSED SUBMISSION VERSION JANUARY 2026

Name	Address	Postcode	Phone Contact	Email
James Attree	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Julie Attree	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Roy Avery	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Amanda Avery	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Chiu Hung Cheung	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Nga Man Yip	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Dalbir Dhillon	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Verdeep Dhillon	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]k
Yuvraj Dhillon	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Wayne Finlay	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Yvonne Finlay	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Jack Finlay	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Serifa Gul	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Graham Johnson	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Susan Johnson	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Luke Johnson	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Ajay Joseph	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

Ria Frances	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Aravindhu Katrangadda	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Sravani Jasti	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Pamela Kerr	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Edward King	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Katie King	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Ramanlal Mistry	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Kaushika Mistry	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Viresh Mistry	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Tri Nguyen	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Jayna Nguyen	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Harry Nottage	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Harriet Davies	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Amit Patel	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Amita Patel	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Dylan Pinker	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Danielle Cooke	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Harry Price	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Jade Price	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Ananth Polamarasetty	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Sudha Doddi	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]

Dr Rajendran Kannan	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Anita Rajendran	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Mark Randle	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Marcia Randle	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Sophie Randle	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Shahjad Singh	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Manpreet Kaur	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Jonathan Skelton	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Samantha Skelton	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Charlotte Skelton	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Olivia Skelton	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Adam Skyner	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Marc Spokes	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Amber Waring	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Tom Steventon	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Nicola Hubbard	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Jay Vaghela	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Hemma Vaghela	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Cliff Warde	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]
Amanda Warde	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]	[redacted]