I would like to submit my comments on the Local Plan Options.

The planning review document states that Rugby Borough can meet its revised LHN figure of 618 dwellings per annum based on the annual delivery of over 1000 dwellings in recent years from existing development sites. This would suggest that there is no need for any additional housing development sites above those listed in the current Local Plan. Additionally, there is no need for those villages closer to Coventry to provide unmet housing need from Coventry at the current time.

Nevertheless the increase in the LHN for Rugby and subsequent call for potential sites has led to new development sites being speculatively proposed for housing.

The Housing and Economic Land Availability Assessment received 261 site options for Rugby of which 149 were ruled out for various enumerated reasons. The Plan Review commissioned by Rugby Borough concluded that the remaining 112 additional site options passing through HELAA is far in excess of what is required under any reasonable scenario and even the 50 site options subsequently progressed in the review together with existing approved sites have capacity far in excess of what is required under any reasonable scenario to meet the 618 dwellings per annum LHN requirement.

Amongst the policy objectives for the new Local Plan, there is no change from the current plan for homes (other than the required number), but there is a new objective to protect and enhance the countryside and to protect productive agricultural land, and the objective to reduce the need to travel and reduce the effects of traffic on communities remains unchanged. The proposed option to develop new housing sites in the rural areas of the Borough would seem to be counter to these planning objectives as they are all on agricultural land and would generate commuter traffic to the place of work. It is unlikely that local public transport services would be enhanced to the extent suggested by the Review.

Of the five scenarios offered by the Review, Scenario 2 would seem to achieve the Borough's LHN objectives without drastically changing the character of the main rural settlements.

Turning to Stretton-on-Dunsmore in particular, I would comment on the four proposed sites.

Site 6 (3 dwellings) previous proposals for 5 dwellings on this site were refused on the grounds that the site was too small to accommodate 5 dwellings to acceptable standards. The proposal for three dwellings is immaterial to Rugby's overall annual housing requirements.

Site 134 (125 homes) should be excluded on the grounds of lack of any strategic need to take the site out of the Green Belt (it is outside the village boundary) and the current use of the site as productive agricultural land (see objectives listed above). The proposed number of dwellings far exceeds the natural requirements of the village and would add to traffic flows within the village and beyond.. Even the Review has concerns on this site regarding further piecemeal expansion / sprawl.

For site 81 (40 homes) and **site 26** (34 homes), these proposals should be excluded on the grounds that the sites were previously considered and rejected, both because of their location in the protected Green Belt "village wedge" and because of site access difficulties as admitted in the Review.

Other villages within the Borough have shown concerns over proposed developments in their area. I would request that the Borough considers very carefully these local opinions, both in broad terms and in detail, when finalising the new Local Plan.