

Part B - Commenting on the Preferred Options

If you are commenting on multiple sections of the document you will need to complete a separate sheet for each representation

Sheet of

Which document are you responding to?

e.g. Preferred Options (Booklet) Preferred Options (Full Version)

Preferred Options full version

Which part of the document are you responding to?

Preferred Option Box (e.g. PO1)

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

Paragraph 7.32

Map (e.g. Preferred Development Sites – Whole District)

What is the nature of your representation?

Support

Object

Please set out full details of your objection or representation of support. If objecting, please set out what changes could be made to resolve your objection (Use a separate sheet if necessary).

Please see attached.

For Official Use Only

Ref:

Rep. Ref.

Summary

Reference should be made in this paragraph to the Coventry Joint Green Belt Review (January 2009) by name, and to the least constrained parcels identified therein. This should include the land between Lillington and Cubbington, Parcel WL10. We consider that parcel of land should be allocated for residential development (see separate representations). However if the land is not to be a Preferred Option proper justification for its exclusion should be provided.

Discussion

Paragraph 7.32 makes reference to a Green Belt study, although the proper name of the study is not given. The study should be properly referenced for clarity.

The Coventry Joint Green Belt Review (January 2009) assessed 117 parcels of land around the edges of Coventry, Nuneaton, Bedworth, Kenilworth, Leamington Spa and Warwick. Of these 41 were identified as being 'least constrained'. Paragraph 7.32 alludes to the outcome of the Study but does not give sufficient detail. This does not provide the clarity required from a Local Plan.

The Study in fact identifies five 'least constrained' parcels of land around Warwick and Leamington. Notwithstanding this paragraph 7.32 completely ignores parcel WL10, land between Lillington and Cubbington which the Study says is suitable for further consideration. Moreover it also makes reference to one site which is not identified in the Study as 'least constrained' as being suitable for development with little justification. The Council must revisit this section and, in the light of the conclusions drawn by the Coventry Joint Green Belt Review, identify that Parcel WL10 is suitable for development (with an allocation in Policy PO4). If the conclusion is drawn that the land should be excluded, proper justification should be provided. A detailed justification as to why a parcel of land not identified in the Study as 'least constrained' should also be given.