Dear Sir/Madam,

These are my representations about the Local Plan.

I wish to **object to the inclusion of Site 134** (Plott Lane, Stretton on Dunsmore) in RBC's draft local plan.

The reasons for my objection are that:

- RBC has not proven that it needs to infringe on the Green Belt contrary to paragraph 145 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The Green Belt needs to be protected and spared from any potential new housing developments. The Green Belt also needs to be protected from any new major land plots being allocated for employment use.
- The **'Rugby Borough Stage 2 Site Options Assessment March 2025'** document states on **page 247**, the original proposal **was to yield 105 homes on this site**. For some **unexplained reason**, it has now been **increased by 20% to 125 homes** (see attached pdf and jpg)**.**
- I believe **Site 134** (Plott Lane, Stretton on Dunsmore), is unsustainable and the necessary **infrastructure does not exist to make this site a viable option,** it should not be considered as sustainable. The local primary school is already at capacity and will not cope with the extra demand the proposed development would generate.
- The proposed **access** to the site is totally **unsuitable** as it's via a **narrow single-track road**, that has **no pavement.** Plott Lane lacks the potential to create suitably safe vehicular access onto the site, as there is a **steep change in the height** between Plott Lane and Site 134 (see photo attached), which would be **extremely dangerous** in icy conditions and **would result in the loss of several existing trees**.
- The increase in traffic that would be generated in Plott Lane by the proposed development, would **increase danger and the risk of accidents** to pedestrians, dog walkers, and the horse-riding community, from within the village and the nearby equestrian centre in Freeboard Lane, that use Plott Lane every day. It would also increase congestion in the village centre.
- Plott Lane is not blessed with suitable **'vehicular passing points'** to allow a smooth flow of traffic, or afford a **safe 'place of refuge'** for the pedestrians, dog walkers, horse and riders that already use the **single-track lane.** This planned development will change an existing quiet country lane, into a busy congested single-track lane that would be **dangerous to all users and unsuitable for two-way traffic**.
- Plott Lane is totally **unsuitable for use of Public Transport**.
- The site is an important **wildlife habitat for the Great Crested Newt**, that breed in the 4 nearby ponds.
- **Plott Lane already floods** due to **surface water drainage** escaping from the site, and is **unsuitable to cope with the extra sewage generated by an additional 105/125 homes.**

- A **public right of way** runs from east to west, straight through the middle of the site, that currently gives stunning views across open countryside, and views of the **village church bell tower**. **These views will be lost forever**. Developing this site **would totally damage the view from a public footpath.**
- The village of Stretton-on-Dunsmore currently consists of about 500 homes. The western Green Belt boundary to the village was adversely compromised under the last Local Plan in 2019, when it was released for the building of **up to 80 homes**, any further piecemeal sprawl (an additional 105/125 homes) would materially **alter the character of the western boundary and the character of the village**.
- The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) 2024 specifically highlights the need to acknowledge the intrinsic qualities of the countryside, including its beauty and natural features.
- Site 134 is currently **valuable crop growing land;** therefore, its loss would impair our ability to feed ourselves.
- **No exceptional circumstances exist** to evidence the release of **Site 134 from the Green Belt** or push the Green Belt boundary by **'sprawling' further westwards** from the village centre.

I am not a 'nimby', I do **propose an alternative site within Stretton on Dunsmore,** north east of Site 134, and to the north of the village centre. This alternative is **Site 120**.

Site 120 has much **safer vehicle access** (A45 and School Lane), and would have **less traffic impact** on the existing narrow lanes within the village, **and still deliver over 100 homes**.

RBC should revisit Site 120 (School Lane, Stretton on Dunsmore), which was identified in the 'Local Plan review - Preferred Option public consultation: evidence base' "Call for Sites" document. **Development Area A**(see attached pdf's), lies **adjacent to the new settlement boundary,** created by the last Local Plan (where Taylor Wimpey is **currently building 55 homes**), and the existing primary school.

By developing Site 120(100+homes), Site 6(3 homes), Site 26(30 homes), Site 81(40 homes) **you would yield 173+ homes within Stretton on Dunsmore, as opposed to the RBC 'targeted' 168 homes.**

The current local plan has a map setting out both current and potential wildlife corridors. This map is supported by policy NE2 which sets standards for new developments in these corridors. **Both the map and the policy have been lost from the draft local plan. The 2023 State of Nature report states that the UK's native species have declined by a fifth since 1970 and one-in-six face extinction.** The 2010 Making Space for Nature highlighted the benefits of providing wildlife corridors. As our climate changes, habitats change too and **our wildlife needs to be able to move across our countryside to seek out appropriate living spaces**. Isolated wildlife populations suffer in-breeding and are less able to respond to environmental change. Wildlife corridors are an important mitigation. The Council's draft economic strategy refers to the promotion of a "Green and sustainable future" and one of the six objectives claimed for the new local plan is that it will **"facilitate a greener, more biodiverse**

borough”. To help RBC achieve these goals **policy NE2 and the wildlife corridor map should be reinstated.**

I would also like to state, **I fully support policy EN5 on tree cover,** because it will help protect our borough from climate change.

