LOCALPLAN helpingshapethedistrict



Publication Draft Representation Form 2014

For Official Use Only	
Person ID:	
Rep ID:	

2 5 JUN 2014

Leamington

This consultation stage is a formal process and represents the last opportunity to comment on the Council's Local Plan and accompanying Sustainability Appraisal (SA) before it is submitted to the Secretary of State. All comments made at this stage of the process are required to follow certain guidelines as set out in the Representation Form Guidance Notes available separately. In particular the notes explain what is meant by legal compliance and the 'tests of soundness'.

This form has two parts:

- Part A Personal Details
- Part B Your Representations

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document, you will need to complete a separate Part B of this form for each representation on each policy.

This form may be photocopied or alternatively extra forms can be obtained from the Council's offices or places where the plan has been made available (see the table below). You can also respond online using the Council's e-Consultation System, visit: www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan

Please provide your contact details so that we can get in touch with you regarding your representation(s) during the examination period. Your comments (including contact details) cannot be treated as confidential because the Council is required to make them available for public inspection. If your address details change, please inform us in writing. You may withdraw your objection at any time by writing to Warwick District Council, address below.

All forms should be received by 4.45pm on Friday 27 June 2014

To return this form, please deliver by hand or post to: Development Policy Manager, Development Services, Warwick District Council, Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Learnington Spa, CV32 5QH or email: newlocalplan@warwickdc.gov.uk

Where to see copies of the Plan

Copies of the Plan are available for inspection on the Council's web site at www.warwickdc.gov.uk/newlocalplan and at the following locations:

Warwick District Council Offices, Riverside House, Milverton Hill, Royal Learnington Spa	
Leamington Town Hall, Parade, Royal Leamington Spa	
Warwickshire Direct Whitnash, Whitnash Library, Franklin Road, Whitnash	
Leamington Spa Library, The Pump Rooms, Parade, Royal Leamington Spa	
Warwickshire Direct Warwick, Shire Hall, Market Square, Warwick	
Warwickshire Direct Kenilworth, Kenilworth Library, Smalley Place, Kenilworth	
Warwickshire Direct Lillington, Lillington Library, Valley Road, Royal Leamington Spa	
Brunswick Healthy Living Centre, 98-100 Shrubland Street, Royal Learnington Spa	
Finham Community Library, Finham Green Rd, Finham, Coventry	

Where possible, information can be made available in other formats, including large print, CD and other languages if required. To obtain one of these alternatives, please contact 01926 410410.

Part A - Personal Details

Title

1 3

1

First Name

Last Name

Job Title (where relevant)

Organisation (where relevant)

Address Line 1

Address Line 2

Address Line 3

Address Line 4

Postcode

Telephone number

Email address



3. Notification of subsequent stages of the Local Plan

Please specify whether you wish to be notified of any of the following:

The submission of the Local Plan for independent examination

Publication of the recommendations of any person appointed to carry out an independent examination of the Local Plan





THIS FORM ACCOMPANIES THE PETITION "PROTECT LILLINGTON GREEN BELT"

-	

Part B - Your Representations

Please note: this section will need to be completed for each representation you make on each separate policy.

4. To which part of the Local Plan or Sustainability Appraisal (SA) does this representation relate?

Local Plan or SA:	Lo	CAL	. PL	AN				
Paragraph Number:								
Policy Number:	DSII	* /	DS	18	;	DS 19		
Policies Map Number:								

- 5. Do you consider the Local Plan is :
- 5.1 Legally Compliant?
- 5.2 Complies with the Duty to Co-operate?
- 5.3 Sound?

Yes	No	
Yes	No	
Yes	No 🗸	

6. If you answered no to question 5.3, do you consider the Local Plan and/or SA unsound because it is not: (please tick that apply):

 \checkmark

Positively Prepared:

Justified:

Effective:

Consistent with National Policy:

THIS FORM ACCOMPANIES THE PETITION "PROTECT LILLINGTON GREEN BELT"

For Official Use Only		
Person ID:	Rep ID:	

DSII

7. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty 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 cooperate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

This policy is contrary to NPPF paras 73, 74: the area is a valued recreational amenity. This policy is contrary to NPPF para 80; the countryside will be encroached. This is not "degraded" green belt land but part of a whole, untouched Landscape. Desk-based studies do not appreciate the true topology - there is no "hard urban edge". This policy is contrary to NPPF para. 80 as no explanation or consideration has been given to local Lillington brownfield sites. This policy is contrary to NPPF para 83 as no "exceptional circumstances" exist. A desire to build new houses is not an continue on a separate sheet if necessary exceptional situation. <u>CONTINUED</u>

8. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 7. above where this relates to soundness. (Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this 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.

Remove Red House Farm green belt from the Local Plan and reinstate the original greenbelt boundary PLEASE READ AND NOTE PETITION

COMMENTS THOSE VENTION

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

For Official Use Only		
Person ID:	Rep ID:	

PSIL

This policy is contrary to NPPF pare. 85 regarding the movement of the green belt baundary to an indefensible line which is easy to breach. A hedge is not a permanent baundary, and further development has already been talked about. This policy is contrary to NPPF para 88 as the green belt remaining would be damaged - bas of openess and permanence.

This policy is contrary to NPPF para 88 as the green belt areas studied were in relation to E-W development between Lillington and Cubbington, which was rejected - and that is a different Landscape. The surrounding southern area of

green belt has not been studied.

This policy is contrary to NPPF para 123 as Warnick District Council has not identified and protected an area which is prized and loved for its recreational amenity and its tranquility, which is rare in this District.

Habitat assessments have not been completed as recommended.

Red House Farm is not included in the "Landscape Sensitivity and Ecological and Geological Study." 7. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty 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 cooperate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

DS18

This policy is contrary to NPPF paras 73, 74: the area is a valued recreational amenity. This policy is contrary to NPPF para 80; the countryside will be encroached. This is not "degraded" green belt land but part of a whole, untouched Landscape. Desk-based studies do not appreciate the true topology - there is no "hard urban edge". This policy is contrary to NPPF para. 80 as no explanation or consideration has been given to local Lillington brownfield sites. This policy is contrary to NPPF para 83 as no exceptional circumstances" exist. A desire to build new houses is not an Continue on a separate sheet if necessary exceptional situation. CONTINUED

8. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 7. above where this relates to soundness. (Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this modification will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpfel if you are able to path for any non-compliance with any non-complication will make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound. It will be helpfel if you are able to path for any non-compliance helpfel if you are able to path for any non-complex path for any non-co

helpful if you are able to put forward your suggested revised wording of any policy or text. Please be as precise as possible.

Remove Red House Farm green belt from the Local Plan and reinstate the original green belt boundary PLEASE READ AND NOTE PETITION COMMENTS

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

For Official Use Only		
Person ID:	Rep ID:	

DS18

This policy is contrary to NPPF pare. 85 regarding the movement of the green bilt baundary to an indefensible line which is easy to breach. A hedge is not a permanent boundary, and further development has already been talked about. This policy is contrary to NPPF para 88 as the green belt remaining would be damaged - bass of openess and permanence. This policy is contrary to NPPF para 88 as the green belt areas studied were in relation to E-W development between Lillington and Cubbington, which was rejected - and that is a different landscape. The surrounding Southern area of

green belt has not been studied.

This policy is contrary to NPPF para 123 as Warnick District Council has not identified and protected an area which is prized and loved for its recreational amenity and its tranquility, which is rare in this District.

This policy is worded vaguely and does not constitute a plan for regeneration. It has not been consulted. There is no plan for regeneration. This policy is incorrect in para 2.77. It should refer to hillington East, which is a fraction of a ward. 7. Please give details of why you consider the Local Plan is not legally compliant or is unsound or fails to comply with the duty 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 cooperate, please also use this box to set out your comments.

DS 19

This policy is contrary to NPPF paras 73, 74: the area is a valued recreational amenity. This policy is contrary to NPPF para 80: the countryside will be encroached. This is not "degraded" green belt land but part of a whole, untouched Landscape. Desk-based studies do not appreciate the true topology - there is no "hard whan edge". This policy is contrary to NPPF para. 80 as no explanation or consideration has been given to local Lillington brownfield sites. This policy is contrary to NPPF pour 83 as no "exceptional circumstances" exist. A desire to build new houses is not an Continue on a separate sheet if necessary exceptional situation. CONTINUED

8. Please set out what modification(s) you consider necessary to make the Local Plan legally compliant or sound, having regard to the test you have identified at 7. above where this relates to soundness. (Please note that any non-compliance with the duty to co-operate is incapable of modification at examination). You will need to say why this 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.

Remove Red House Fam green belt from the Local Plan and reinstate the original greenbelt baundary.

PLEASE READ AND NOTE PETITION COMMENTS

Continue on a separate sheet if necessary

Please note your representation should cover succinctly all the information, evidence and supporting information necessary to support/justify the representation and the suggested modification, as there will not normally be a subsequent opportunity to make further representations based on the original representation at publication stage. After this stage, further submissions will be only at the request of the Inspector, based on the matters and issues he/she identifies for examination.

Rep ID:	•
	Rep ID:

DS 19

This policy is contrary to NPPF pare. 85 regarding the movement of the green belt boundary to an indefensible line which is easy to breach. A hedge is not a permanent boundary, and further development has already been talked about. This policy is contrary to NPPF para 88 as the green belt remaining would be damaged - bar

of openess and permanence.

This policy is contrary to NPFF para 88 as the green belt areas studied were in relation to E-W development between Lillington and Cubbington, which was rejected - and that is a different Landscape. The surrounding southern area of

green belt has not been studied.

This policy is contrary to NPPF para 123 as Warnick District Council has not identified and protected an area which is prized and loved for its recreational amenity and its tranquility. Which is rare in this District.

This policy is contrary to the aim of preventing wrban sprawl in NPPF para 80. Councillors are expecting to "review" the boundary again to allow more housing, eventually creating a large housing estate. 9. If your representation is seeking a modification, do you consider it necessary to participate at the oral part of the examination?

No, I do not wish to participate at the oral examination

Yes, I wish to participate at the oral examination

. . . .

10. If you wish to participate at the oral part of the examination, please outline why you consider this to be necessary:

To explain the many aspects of the arguments against building at Red House Farm.

Please note: This written representation carries the same weight and will be subject to the same scrutiny as oral representations. The Inspector will determine the most appropriate procedure to adopt to hear those who have indicated that they wish to participate at the oral part of the examination.

11. Declaration

I understand that all comments submitted will be considered in line with this consultation, and that my comments will be made publicly available and may be identifiable to my name/organisation.



on behalf of frotect Lillingian Greenbelt

Date :

Copies of all the objections and supporting representations will be made available for others to see at the Council's offices at Riverside House and online via the Council's e-consultation system. Please note that all comments on the Local Plan are in the public domain and the Council cannot accept confidential objections. The information will be held on a database and used to assist with the preparation of the new Local Plan and with consideration of planning applications in accordance with the Data Protection Act 1998.

For Official Use Only		A STATISTICS AND A STAT
Person ID:	Rep ID:	