

## 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)

PO4

Paragraph number / Heading / Subheading (if relevant)

Distribution of Sites for Housing Omission Site

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

3

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

We object to the failure to allocate land at Glebe Farm, Cubbington, for residential development. Some or all of the land shown on the attached drawing (reference 6009-100) should be allocated for residential development with associated amenity space and included on Map 3 as a Preferred Option. The Green Belt boundary should be amended accordingly.

***Note: the land now shown as available for development is greater than that previously promoted. It includes all the land up to the built up boundaries with Cubbington and Lillington. The previous submission excluded land owned by the Trusts in error.***

## Discussion

The SHLAA indicates the site in question is not suitable because the development of the land previously identified, with up to 150 dwellings, would lack cohesion with the existing settlements. This is presumably because the land previously promoted excluded parcels abutting the houses which front Cubbington Road, the Catholic School and the Cubbington Sports and Social Club. It has come to light that the land between that previously promoted and the aforementioned developments is controlled by the promoters and is therefore available for development. Development for housing which abuts the existing built frontages would not lack cohesion and would be an appropriate location.

In particular this area of land was identified in the Joint Green Belt Study as one of the 'least constrained' parcels of land on the edge of Leamington Spa, yet the Council seem to have ignored this. Separate representations are made on this matter. It is inappropriate for the Council to allocate land which was not concluded to be 'least constrained' where 'least constrained' sites remain available.

The SHLAA specifically notes that development as proposed would result in the loss of the gap between Cubbington and Lillington. There are many instances where outlying villages have been encompassed into larger settlements without detriment to the individuality of either. This remains a sensible solution where development elsewhere would have greater adverse impact on, for example, the wider landscape of the Green Belt. In this case there would be no harm if Lillington and Cubbington were joined by more development than is currently the case.

If the coalescence remains a particular concern to the Council consideration should be given solely to developing land on one side or the other, and thereby retaining a reasonable open gap between the settlements. In particular it would be appropriate to develop on the north eastern part of the site to meet the needs of Cubbington, leaving land to the south abutting Lillington free from development.

Policy PO4 indicates that Cubbington should have between 30 and 80 additional dwellings during the emerging Plan period. There are no sites available within the settlement which can accommodate that level of development. It is therefore necessary to look at land abutting the edge of the settlement.

The land around Cubbington is generally very constrained. Several sites have been promoted for development through the 2012 SHLAA (specifically sites L17, L18, L19, L20, L22 and L43). Each and every one of the sites has been discounted for adverse landscape impact, being the impact on areas of high landscape value. Some sites are also discounted for either being inappropriate directions for growth or for flooding reasons. No site has been considered appropriate.

The land hereby promoted at Glebe Farm is not in an area of high landscape value, and it will not worsen any flooding which occurs in Cubbington. Moreover it is considered by the Green Belt Study to be one which is 'least constrained' (when none of the other have). The

site lies adjacent to the school and social club, and within easy walking distance of the centre of Cubbington as well as local shops on the Cubbington Road and the buses thereon. Development would provide the opportunity to enhance the existing edge of the settlement.

The development of the land promoted would provide the opportunity to create public amenity space to overcome some of the considerable shortfall in the vicinity of the site as identified in the Green Infrastructure Study (2010). Development elsewhere around Cubbington would not assist in meeting the needs of the wider area.

Land should therefore be removed from the Green Belt with a view to its allocation to meet the needs of Cubbington.

Enc Drawing 6009-100

