



**South West Rugby Masterplan SPD**

**Adoption Statement – Appendix A**

**Modifications made as a result of representations received**

**June 2021**

Development Strategy



## Introduction

1.1 This appendix to the Adoption Statement for the South West Rugby Masterplan Supplementary Planning Document (SWR SPD) sets out the modifications made as result of the representations received to the public consultation held in October 2020 on the revised draft SWR SPD. It identifies the key issues raised by respondents to the consultation and the Council's response including the modifications to the revised draft SWR SPD. This appendix also sets out details of the October 2020 public consultation and lists the individuals and organisations who responded to the consultation.

### Revised Draft SWR SPD Consultation October 2020

1.2 The consultation period on the revised draft SWR SPD took place from 1<sup>st</sup> to 29<sup>th</sup> October 2020.

1.3 The consultation was carried out in accordance with Regulations 12 and 13 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as amended, and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement (2019). During the Coronavirus (COVID-19) pandemic the Government introduced new temporary Planning Practice Guidance (PPG) which enabled local planning authorities to review and update any policies in their SCI which they could not comply with due to the guidance to help combat the spread of Coronavirus. On 25<sup>th</sup> August 2020, Council agreed Supplementary Guidance to the SCI in accordance with the temporary PPG. This Supplementary Guidance to the SCI applied to the revised draft SWR SPD consultation in October 2020.

1.4 The details of the consultation including where to view the revised draft SWR SPD and how to respond were published on the Council's website and in the Rugby Observer newspaper. The consultation was promoted via the Council's social media channels on Facebook and Twitter. A press release was also issued.

1.5 All statutory consultees (including Parish Councils) and any individuals and businesses whose details were held on the Planning Policy Database received either a letter or an email notifying them of the consultation and where to view the document. Following the introduction of GDPR legislation, the Planning Policy Database had been updated to include only those the Council had a duty to consult, and those who had 'opted in' or expressed a wish to be notified of future Local Plan documents.

1.6 Copies of the consultation documents were made available on the Council's website. Representations could be made by email, post or by using an online form.



- 1.7 172 responses from individuals and organisations submitted 624 individual comments, also known as representations, within the consultation period for consideration by the Council. 16 responses from individuals and organisations submitted 52 late representations, i.e. after the consultation had closed. Regulation 13 (2) of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 states the representations must be received by the local planning authority by the closing date specified. This means that acceptance and consideration of late representations is at the discretion of the Council. On this occasion the Council received a number of late representations from statutory bodies that are material to the content of the SPD and the number of late representations is comparatively small, therefore all the late representations received have been accepted.
- 1.8 Appendix A-1 below lists the individuals and organisations who made representations within the consultation period. Appendix A-2 below lists the individuals and organisations who submitted representations late, i.e. after the consultation had closed.
- 1.9 In terms of policy areas, connectivity and highways, the Rugby to Dunchurch landscaped buffer, open space, and woodland management received the highest number of comments. In addition, the level of complexity within some representations in respect of legal compliance, the NPPF and Local Plan compliance has been considered in depth.
- 1.10 In response to the October 2020 consultation Table 1 below sets out a summary of the key issues raised by section of the revised draft SWR SPD (October 2020), the Council's response and the main SPD modifications as included in the adoption version SWR SPD (June 2021).

**Table 1: Summary of representations received, Rugby Borough Council officer response and main SPD modifications**

SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
General Comments	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Questioning the need for the development.</li> <li>• Questioning the process and consultation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The need for the SWR allocation has already been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan.</li> <li>• SPD consultation undertaken in accordance with the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012, as amended and the Council’s adopted Statement of Community Involvement 2019, as amended August 2020. Consultation Strategy approved by Cabinet on 7 September 2020.</li> </ul>
Legal Compliance	No representations received.	-
NPPF	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD should reflect NPPF in relation to design.</li> <li>• SPD reflects NPPF in relation to securing a safe environment through social infrastructure, making sufficient provision for security infrastructure, and through joint working by all partners.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The design section and Appendices D and E of the SPD address design matters and identify design principles.</li> <li>• Support for approach in SPD to a safer community welcomed.</li> </ul>
Local Plan Compliance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD fails to provide a comprehensive basis towards successful delivery of Policies DS8 and DS9 of the Local Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It is considered that the SPD is in accordance with the adopted Local Plan, including Policies DS8 and DS9.</li> </ul>
1. Introduction	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes suggested to clarify when variations to the Figure 2 masterplan would be acceptable.</li> <li>• Amend throughout to ‘Framework Masterplan’.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD amended to clarify when variations to the Figure 2 masterplan would be acceptable.</li> <li>• ‘Framework Masterplan’ change not necessary.</li> <li>• Section updated to reflect adoption version.</li> </ul>
2. Planning Policy and Guidance	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the approach in Paragraph 2.3 to securing the equitable apportionment of the required strategic infrastructure delivery costs between the development parcels on the allocation.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Section updated to reflect adoption version.</li> </ul>

SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
3. The Site and its Context	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Mixed response to the reference to land equalisation in Paragraph 3.9.</li> <li>• Amend Figure 1 to show land permitted for employment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reference to land equalisation is a factual matter and will be addressed through the delivery of the SWR allocation – no change necessary. Added reference to land for schools and the fire and rescue facility.</li> <li>• For clarity Figure 1 amended to also show the current employment planning permissions.</li> </ul>
4. Objectives	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes suggested to the green infrastructure corridor objective for clarity.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD green infrastructure objective amended to clarify that the creation of the new green infrastructure corridor between Cock Robin Wood and Cawston Spinney will also need to take account of the need to deliver the spine road network, internal access roads and the design guidance in the SPD. Also, amended to clarify that drainage and SuDs may be able to be interlinked or combined.</li> </ul>
5. South West Rugby Masterplan	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Changes suggested to clarify when variations to the Figure 2 masterplan would be acceptable.</li> <li>• Main changes requested to Figure 2 Masterplan: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- District Centre – move further south.</li> <li>- Co-located Primary &amp; Secondary Schools – move further south.</li> <li>- Cawston Lane Sustainable Transport Corridor – should be all traffic.</li> <li>- Development Spine Road – unnecessary/ should be amended.</li> <li>- Open Space – remove open space on Taylor Wimpey’s land.</li> <li>- Potsford Dam Link – amend route.</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Figure 2 - detailed factual updates/ clarifications sought.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD amended to clarify when variations to the Figure 2 masterplan would be acceptable.</li> <li>• Figure 2 in SPD amended: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- District Centre and co-located Primary &amp; Secondary Schools – SPD amended to show District Centre further south, closer to the Homestead Link to maximise visibility and viability but still in close proximity to the co-located primary &amp; secondary schools, which have also moved south. This ensures that the District Centre is in a sustainable location, reducing the need to travel outside South West Rugby and enabling walking and cycling access to the District Centre as well as shared trips, e.g. to the schools.</li> <li>- Cawston Lane Sustainable Transport Corridor – No change in SPD as indicative layout as shown in Local Plan Policy DS9 to be finalised through the planning applications process in agreement with WCC Highways.</li> <li>- Development Spine Road – No change in SPD as indicative layout as shown in Local Plan Policy DS9 to be finalised through the planning applications process in agreement with WCC Highways.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>

SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Open Space – No change in SPD as Figure 2 is indicative.</li> <li>- Potsford Dam Link – SPD amended to show amended the updated route (directly to the B4642/A4071 junction) which is agreed with Warwickshire County Council Highways.</li> <li>• For clarity – Figure 2 checked and updated where necessary for factual changes and clarity.</li> </ul>
6. Phasing and Delivery	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Phasing should be shown as indicative and flexible.</li> <li>• Changes suggested to the housing and infrastructure phasing.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD amended to clarify that phasing and costs are indicative.</li> <li>• SPD Appendices K and L amended to update the housing and infrastructure phasing to reflect the current position and the latest information provided by the South West Rugby landowners/developers and infrastructure and service providers.</li> <li>• For clarity added reference in SPD to Policy DS8’s requirement for development proposals to come forward comprehensively and in accordance with Policies DS8, DS9, the Policies Map, the IDP and this SPD.</li> <li>• For clarity - Figure 3 checked and updated where necessary to reflect changes to Figure 2 and updates to the housing and infrastructure phasing in Appendices K and L.</li> </ul>
7. Green and Blue Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for the green &amp; blue infrastructure network</li> <li>• Perceived loss of specific ‘dark corridor’ for wildlife.</li> <li>• SPD should acknowledge that not all natural assets can be retained.</li> <li>• Figure 4 - Detailed factual updates/ clarifications sought.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Support for green &amp; blue infrastructure network welcomed.</li> <li>• The continuous tree corridor is shown on Figure 4 in the SPD. Reference is also already included to dark corridors.</li> <li>• SPD amended to clarify that the creation of the new Green Infrastructure corridor will also need to take account of the need to deliver the spine road network, internal access roads and the design guidance in the SPD.</li> <li>• For clarity - Figure 4 checked and update where necessary to reflect changes to Figure 2.</li> </ul>

SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
8. Rugby to Dunchurch Landscaped Buffer	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern that the buffer is not large enough or what the Local Plan Inspector promised.</li> <li>Reference to the Rainsbrook Valley Landscape Sensitivity Study should be removed from the SPD as it clearly relates to only a small part of the allocation and played no part in informing the Local Plan.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Figure 2 of the SPD identifies the buffer between Rugby and Dunchurch which incorporates a green infrastructure corridor from Cock Robin Wood to Cawston Spinney, as required by Local Plan Policy DS8. Section 8 of the SPD sets out guidance for planning applicants and application decision-makers in terms of the form and function of the buffer to ensure the physical and visual separation of Rugby town and Dunchurch are maintained.</li> <li>The Rainsbrook Valley Landscape Sensitivity Study was part of the Local Plan evidence base.</li> <li>The flooding and drainage paragraphs in the Rugby to Dunchurch landscaped buffer section have been amended to clarify the flood risk and drainage considerations, and the requirements for planning applications in relation to these matters.</li> </ul>
9. Woodland Management	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about potential pressure for existing ancient woodland/Cawston Spinney from recreational use.</li> <li>Clarify size of the woodland buffer and where it should be measured from/what is included and the use of the buffer zone.</li> <li>Concern that the woodland buffer size has changed from 50m to 15m.</li> <li>Amend reference to zero lux for dark zones &amp; replace with reference to Bats &amp; Artificial Lighting in the UK Guidance (Bat Conservation Trust).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>In accordance with the Natural England Standing Advice and Local Plan Policy DS8 the SPD provides for a minimum buffer zone of 15 metres around the ancient woodland at Cawston Spinney.</li> <li>SPD amended to clarify the form of the ancient woodland buffer zone at Cawston Spinney and the expected light levels along the dark corridors.</li> <li>SPD amended to clarify the Council's preferred option for the delivery of the Woodland Management Plan.</li> </ul>
10. Open Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Need for a new park/questioning where it will be located.</li> <li>Pandemic highlights importance of open space for mental well-being.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD provides for over 65 hectares of open space. The type of open space required is set out in Table 2 of the SPD.</li> </ul>

SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Insufficient clarity on meeting sports demand, e.g. football and cricket.</li> <li>Woodland should be included in open space calculations.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The open space provision table (Table 2) in the SPD has been updated to clarify how and where the open space can be provided, and further explanation has been included of the outdoor sports provision.</li> </ul>
11. Climate Change	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not taking account of climate change obligations.</li> <li>Should require net zero carbon/carbon neutral standards in new buildings &amp; green electricity such as solar panels, ground source heat pumps, electric vehicle charging points.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD can only provide further detailed guidance on Local Plan policies. It cannot conflict with the adopted Local Plan by requiring net zero carbon or carbon neutral standards.</li> </ul>
12. Flooding and Sustainable Drainage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing flooding issues/cumulative issues need to be considered.</li> <li>Individual site Flood Risk Assessments and drainage strategies more appropriate than a single allocation or site-wide one due to numbers of development parcels &amp; stages.</li> <li>Infiltration testing requirements by parcel not required as work already carried out on parts of allocation.</li> <li>EA recommend detailed hydraulic modelling of watercourses.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The flooding and sustainable drainage section in the SPD has been amended to clarify the flood risk and drainage considerations, and the requirements for planning applications in relation to these matters. Co-ordination of flood risk assessments and drainage strategies is encouraged.</li> </ul>
13. Biodiversity	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about species protection e.g. bats and hedgehogs.</li> <li>Perceived loss of specific 'dark corridor' for wildlife.</li> <li>SPD should acknowledge that not all natural assets can be retained.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Warwickshire County Council Ecology have been fully engaged in the preparation of the SWR SPD. This has informed provision for species protection and appropriate mitigation measures, e.g. lighting. The Council will continue to engage with WCC Ecology as part of the determination of planning applications and the implementation of the allocation.</li> </ul>



SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support for the approach to biodiversity off-setting.</li> <li>Figure 8 inconsistent with the 15 metre buffer for ancient woodland.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The continuous tree corridor is shown on Figure 4 in the SPD. Reference is also included to dark corridors.</li> <li>SPD amended to amended to clarify that there may be circumstances when it may not be possible to retain all biodiversity features, such as the construction of the spine road network.</li> <li>SPD amended to clarify that any proposed loss of biodiversity features will need to be justified through the planning application process and mitigation measures identified.</li> <li>Support for the approach to biodiversity off-setting welcomed.</li> <li>For clarity, Figure 8 deleted.</li> <li>For clarity added reference into Policy NE1 that requires an assessment of any impacts on protected and priority species and to ensure net gain in biodiversity.</li> </ul>
14. Housing Mix and Affordable Housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about delivering sufficient levels of affordable housing.</li> <li>Changes requested to enable more up to date evidence of market signals/ need to be considered if it is available.</li> <li>Clarify self-build &amp; custom housebuilding requirements.</li> <li>Mixed response to reference to specialist housing, such as Extra Care &amp; Specialised Housing</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Local Plan Policy H2 contains affordable housing requirement of 30% for greenfield sites. Levels of affordable housing will be expected to be provided unless a viability assessment shows that such levels would not be viable.</li> <li>SPD amended to clarify that the specific provision and mix of a site will be informed by evidence available at the time of the planning application.</li> <li>SPD amended to clarify the approach and requirements in relation to self-build and custom housebuilding.</li> <li>SPD amended to clarify the approach and requirements in relation to specialist housing.</li> </ul>
15. District Centre	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Greater clarity required in terms of location, size &amp; function of the District Centre, especially in the light of changing shopping habits.</li> <li>Clarify the circumstances when other retailing and local facilities would be acceptable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The requirements for the District Centre as set out in Local Plan Policy DS8 have been clarified. The expected size of the District Centre has been updated to refer to a maximum size and clarify that any planning application for the District Centre will need to be supported by robust market and retail evidence demonstrating that the proposed quantum of</li> </ul>

SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
		<p>floorspace is appropriate for the new community and a viable new District Centre. This reflects uncertainties in the light of changing shopping habits.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD amended to clarify the circumstances when other retailing and local facilities will be acceptable in other appropriate locations across South West Rugby.</li> </ul>
16. Education and Community Facilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that school provision is inadequate and phasing is unclear.</li> <li>• Questioning reasons for moving co-located primary/ secondary school.</li> <li>• No reference to community/ meeting halls.</li> <li>• Support for provision for Safer Neighbourhood Team (Police).</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD sets out the school provision and phasing.</li> <li>• The requirements for the education and community facilities as set out in Local Plan Policy DS8 have been clarified. A new paragraph has been added to explain the provision of a GP surgery and other local facilities including dedicated space for community use.</li> <li>• SPD amended to clarify that new schools will be required having regard to up to date evidence of existing schools' capacity and the number of new school places generated by the South West Rugby development.</li> <li>• Support for provision for Safer Neighbourhood Team (Police) welcomed.</li> </ul>
17. Health	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that hospital &amp; GPs will not cope with the population increase from the development.</li> <li>• Concern about potential late delivery of healthcare facilities, e.g. Houlton</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Local Plan Infrastructure Delivery Plan makes provision for health infrastructure and this is included in Appendices K and L of the SPD. Local healthcare stakeholders have been consulted on the development of the Rugby Local Plan and the SWR SPD.</li> </ul>
18. Employment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding impact of large 'sheds' or warehouses, development near to villages of historic interest and roads that are already overcrowded.</li> <li>• Adequate buffer and green spaces between existing areas needed.</li> <li>• Design guidance is overly prescriptive.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The impact of development has already been considered as part of the preparation of the Local Plan. Local Plan Policy DS8 requires employment proposals to mitigate their impact and this is reflected in the SPD.</li> <li>• The employment section has been updated to reflect that the employment land has an outline planning permission. The requirements for the employment allocation as set out in Local Plan Policy DS8 have been clarified. The landscape and visual impact assessment and mitigation requirements have been clarified.</li> </ul>

SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
19. Connectivity and Highways	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Deliver all roads first before any development occurs.</li> <li>• The road proposals will not work and will lead to chaos.</li> <li>• Support for cycling and walking but lack of detail of routes.</li> <li>• Homestead Link: Mixed support for alignment, should connect directly to M45, impact on existing properties.</li> <li>• Unclear what is proposed for Cawston Lane – should be open to all-traffic.</li> <li>• Amend Potsford Dam Link alignment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Local Plan process considered the infrastructure needed for the South West Rugby development. The Infrastructure Delivery Plan in the Local Plan sets out the phasing of the development and infrastructure. This phasing is included in Figure 3 and Appendices K and L of the SPD.</li> <li>• Detailed cycling and walking routes will be developed as part of the preparation of the planning applications for the development.</li> <li>• Explanation that the precise alignment and detailed design of the Homestead Link are matters for detailed consideration and confirmation through the determination of the planning application for the Homestead Link in accordance with Local Plan Policies DS8 and DS9.</li> <li>• Further explanation of the reasons for the Sustainable Transport Link.</li> <li>• Further explanation of the phased delivery of the Potsford Dam Link.</li> </ul>
20. Design	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns about the size/ design of the Rugby to Dunchurch buffer and impact on separation distances/ privacy.</li> <li>• Provide good quality public transport, cycle network &amp; open spaces and future-proof the development.</li> <li>• Support for Secured by Design principles (Police).</li> <li>• Housing densities should be clearly defined – higher densities within &amp; close to District Centre.</li> <li>• Add reference to efficient use of land.</li> <li>• Concern about warehouse design &amp; impacts, e.g. light pollution.</li> <li>• Retention of trees and hedgerows and their integration into the design.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• SPD amended to clarify that development parcels close to existing urban areas should be sympathetically designed to not have a negative impact on the amenity of residents in adjoining areas.</li> <li>• Support for Secured by Design principles welcomed.</li> <li>• SPD amended to clarify that higher densities would be expected within and immediately adjacent to the District Centre.</li> <li>• SPD amended to add reference to efficient use of land.</li> <li>• The SPD is not considered onerous in relation to the residential design principle that ‘opportunities should be taken to incorporate renewable and low carbon technologies into the design of development, ...’.</li> <li>• The water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day is required by Local Plan Policy SDC4.</li> <li>• The SPD provides for public transport, cycling, walking and open spaces. It also requires the retention of trees and hedgerows, and protection of wildlife. The employment section and Appendix E of the SPD set out the requirements for the design of employment including warehouses.</li> </ul>

SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ensure wildlife is protected through good design.</li> <li>• Inclusion of renewable &amp; low carbon technologies supported but developer concerns around costs.</li> <li>• Water efficiency standard of 110 litres per person per day too restrictive.</li> </ul>	
21. Heritage	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consider impact on heritage &amp; character of nearby villages and listed buildings.</li> <li>• Expand to highlight the archaeological potential of South West Rugby.</li> <li>• Corrections required to the Listed Buildings list.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Potential harm to designated and undesignated heritage assets must be justified by the applicant/developer at the planning application stage in accordance with the Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Areas) Act 1990, the NPPF and Policy SDC3 of the Local Plan.</li> <li>• Section 21 expanded to explain the archaeological potential of SWR and that any planning application submitted for this area should include an archaeological assessment.</li> <li>• Listed Buildings list corrected.</li> </ul>
22. Noise, Odour and Lighting	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concerns regarding noise and light pollution from the South West Rugby development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The SPD sets out the approach to potential noise and light pollution. No change required.</li> </ul>
23. Air Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Concern that the South West Rugby development will make air quality worse, including in Dunchurch.</li> <li>• SPD should acknowledge that infrastructure, such as the Homestead Link, will improve air quality.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The infrastructure set out in the SPD will help to address existing air quality issues.</li> <li>• SPD amended to clarify the Policy H5 requirements including for air quality reports to be submitted with planning applications for major developments, and to include examples of onsite mitigation measures. Air quality improvements would be considered within the air quality report.</li> </ul>

SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
24. Utilities	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Concern about impact of the South West Rugby development on existing properties' utilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The SPD adequately addresses these matters. The utility companies have been consulted on the SPD and were consulted on the Local Plan. Developers will consult with the utility companies regarding the detail of their proposals. Minor wording changes for clarity.</li> </ul>
25. Section 106 Framework	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Request for further information about the S106 Framework from the South West Rugby Consortium including costs, works in kind, apportionment, review mechanisms, provision of land, definitions.</li> <li>A consistent approach with a S106 template.</li> <li>Must be compliant with Regulation 122 of Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010: necessary to make the development acceptable in planning terms, directly related to the development, fairly &amp; reasonably related in scale &amp; kind to the development.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPD amended to clarify the approach to works in kind, review and reimbursement of contributions. Reference added to regulation 122 of the Community Infrastructure Levy Regulations 2010.</li> </ul>
26. Viability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Clarification sought on the independent viability assessment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPD amended to clarify the financial viability assessment requirements including in relation to affordable housing obligations.</li> </ul>
27. Submission Documents	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Remove references to 'site wide' drainage strategy and 'site wide' Flood Risk Assessment as individual applications will be submitted.</li> <li>Remove 'Construction Management Plan' as it is likely this would be conditioned.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>SPD amended to replace 'site wide' drainage strategy and 'site wide' Flood Risk Assessment with 'Site-specific' drainage strategy and Flood Risk Assessment.</li> <li>SPD amended to delete reference to 'Construction Management Plan' as this would be conditioned.</li> <li>SPD amended to clarify when an air quality assessment and an air quality report are required.</li> <li>SPD amended to clarify when a transport assessment, a transport statement and a travel plan are required.</li> </ul>

SPD section	Representations Summary Oct 2020	RBC Response/ Summary of main SPD Modifications
Appendices	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix D – Changes to location and design principles for education requested.</li> <li>• Appendices K and L - Clarification that the infrastructure costs and the phasing are indicative.</li> <li>• Appendix K - Clarification and updates of the infrastructure costs requested.</li> <li>• Appendix L - Updates of the phasing requested.</li> <li>• Appendix N – Latest Woodland Management Plan June 2020 should be included.</li> <li>• Appendix O - Comparative review of District and Local Centre provision considered flawed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Appendix D sets out the local education authority’s location and design requirements for all schools.</li> <li>• The indicative housing and infrastructure phasing and costs in Appendices K and L of the SPD have been updated to reflect the current position and the latest information provided by the South West Rugby landowners/ developers and infrastructure and service providers.</li> <li>• Appendix N of the SPD has been updated with the latest Woodland Management Plan.</li> <li>• The comparative review of district and local centre provision in Appendix O of the SPD is considered unnecessary and has been removed.</li> </ul>



## Appendix A-1 – Individuals and organisations who made representations to the Revised Draft South West Rugby SPD in October 2020

First Name	Surname	Organisation
Kieran	Beanland	
Dr G J	Nicholson	Inland Waterways Association
Gordon	Berridge	
Julian	Woolley	
Valerie	Mitchell	
Simon	Ward	
Jenny	Vekic	
Blanaid	Cook	
Katherine	Hudson	
Afua	Osei	
Karen	Adam	
David	Brook	
Richard	Jackson	
Karen	Carter	
Nicholas	Line & family	
Victoria	Smith	
M J	Parker	
K W	Turner	
Brian	Nesbit	
John	Robards	Friends of Lime Tree Avenue
E L	Evans	
Richard	Walker	
Chris	Reading	
Shobhna	Chohan	
Richard	Allanach	

First Name	Surname	Organisation
Brian	Phillips	
Emily	Kingswell	Place Partnership for Warwickshire Police
Ian	Dickinson	Canal and River Trust
Michael	Judge	Save Dunchurch Action Group
Dan	Lamb	Warwickshire County Council - Lead Local Flood Authority
Cheryl	Turner	
Dr A	Canale-Parola	Rugby Health and Care Improvement Forum
Julie	Hinds	
Barrie	Bemand	
Mr R	Mitchell-King	
James	Severn	
Dr A	McFarland	
Simon	Sutton	
Fran	Fuller	
Jane	Harrisson	
Steven	Rees	
David	Brockway	
Diane	Flavell	
Matt	Verlander	Avison Young for National Grid
Jeanette	Mitchell-King	
Jennifer	Oldfield	
Janet	Milwain	
Pauline	Pickard	
Louise	Courtneil-McNeilage	
Brian	Pedley	
Mrs Maureen	Steer	
Gabs	Cooper	



First Name	Surname	Organisation
Lynne	Brushett	
Stuart	Boulton	
Dr J R	Ponsford	
Margaret	Richards	
Julie	Hinds	
Richard	Howarth	
Rajvir	Bahey	Sport England
Chris	Worman	Rugby Borough Council - Parks and Grounds Unit
Sylvia	Jacques	Thurlaston Parish Council
Austin	Mitchell-King	
Gill	Peacock	Dunchurch Parish Council
Elizabeth	Thompson	
Kay	Thorpe	
Karen & Roger	Dent	
Isla	Barrack	
Henry	Mahalski	
Rob	Sargent	Natural England
Stuart	Jones	
Helen & Dave	Massie	
Philippa	Belcher	
Juliette	Crossin	
Paul	Bradshaw	
Anne	Knott	
Melanie	Lindsley	The Coal Authority
Mr P & Mrs R	Wattam	
Gillian	Western	
John	Robards	

First Name	Surname	Organisation
Patteeswaran	Sellamuthu	
Jane	Clews	
Dennis & Heather	Orton	
Sivaram	Asok	
Kathryn & Jim	Stewart	
Gill	Stringer	
Keith	Brushett	
Brian	Coleman	
Sarah	Coulon	
Lee	Chase	
Kerry	Jackson	
Steve	Jackson	
Paul	Wallace	
Joshua	Brimley	
Mark & Bridget	Rothwell	
Helen	Wallace	
Mr Kartik & Mrs Revathi	Palaniappan/ Rayar	
Des	Creery	
Anne-Marie	Rose	
Bonnie	Moran	
Stephen	Grant	
Steve	Whitehouse	
Catherine	O'Toole	Pegasus for Richborough Estates
Dinesh	Reddy	
Alan	Merrick	
M	Ackam	
Joe	Garthwaite	

First Name	Surname	Organisation
Sue	Winton	
Dr Alireza & Mrs B	Veshagh	
Mark and Jane	Lambert	
Ben	Borthwick	Smith Jenkins for Mr Demis Ohandjanian
Greg	Winton	
James/ Julie	Pleavin/ Brammar	
Robert	Nash	Cawston Parish Council
Erica	Milwain	
Kate	Aluze-Ele	
Stewart and Ann	Wright	
Ilke	Cochrane	
Brian and Jackie	Bowsher	
Lorna	Garthwaite	
Robert	Cooper	
John and Valerie	Chapman	
Selina	Larque	
Amy and Anthony	Cahill	
Lynn	Fuller	
David	Cochrane	
Andrew	Larque	
C G	Webster	
Dianne	Jones	
Ben	Frodsham	Homes England
Yvonne	Merrick	
Norman	Lines	
Paul	Henden	
Sarah	Green	

First Name	Surname	Organisation
Helen	Creery	
Peter	Steer	
Emmanuel	Coulon	
J M	Smith	
Bob	Beggs	
Maralyn	Pickup	
Gary	Stephens	Marrons Planning for L&Q Estates
Gemma	Johnson	Barton Willmore for Taylor Wimpey
Janet	Neale	Warwickshire County Council
Louise	Steele	Framptons for Tritax Symmetry
Rosamund	Worrall	Historic England
Helen & Melvyn	Macartney	
Paul	Kilborn	
A E	Molyneaux	
Anthony	Smith	
Rebecca	Madden	
Adrian	Cannell	
Craig	Marsden	
Lucy		
Mark	Gozdecki	
Elizabeth	Satinet	
Cara		
Chris	Reading	
Aaron	Sutcliffe	
Jose	Martins	
Daniel	Clark	
Mrs ME	Dean	



First Name	Surname	Organisation
Patrick	Kealey	
Isabel	Draper	
Susan	Kealey	
Stephanie	Clifford	
L.J.J.	Donnelly	
Julie	Monk	
David	Hume	
Carol	Knee	
K	Polley	
Eddie	Kealey	
Kenneth	Knott	
Alan	Horton	

Appendix A-2 – Individuals and organisations who made late representations to the Revised Draft South West Rugby SPD

First Name	Surname	Organisation
Fiona	Macartney	
Paul	Kilborn	
Keith	Brushett	
Barry	White	
Anna	Stocks	Warwickshire County Council Archaeology
Louise	Sherwell	Warwickshire County Council Ecology
Joanne	Archer	Warwickshire County Council Transport Planning & Development Management (Highways)
Shirley	Hall	
Graham & Wendy	Varnish	
John	Richmond	
Jeremy	Wright MP	
Ludmila	Enticott	
Valerie & Christopher	Matthews-Lane/ Lane	
John	Bretherton	
Samuel	Penford	Environment Agency
Mr R	Mitchell-King	Residents of 50-58 Rugby Road