

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 25 January 2024 12:27  
**To:** Local Plan  
**Subject:** Local plan employment Land

To whom it may concern,

**I protest** to any change of current green belt designated land to be used as employment land especially when the land is productive farm land as is the case for the proposal around junction 2 M6.

**Government policy on protection for the Green Belt is set out in chapter 13 of the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF)**, which opens by stating that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts. On protecting the Green Belt, the NPPF urges Local Planning Authorities (LPAs) to maximise the use of suitable brownfield sites before considering changes to Green Belt boundaries. The NPPF demands that there should be “exceptional circumstances” before Green Belt boundaries can be changed and says that inappropriate development is harmful to the Green Belt and should be approved only in “very special circumstances”.

The growth forecast, indicated at paragraph 4.17, which applies standard employment densities and plot ratios as set out in the Employment Land Study, creates a net land requirement for 79 hectares of employment land. However, in forming the employment land target to identify how much land to allocate in the Local Plan, past take up rates have been considered to inform the 110-hectare target to meet Rugby’s need. The addition of this margin provides a target (equating to just below 7 hectares per annum for the remainder of the plan period) that aligns with the Employment Land Study recommendation that 6 – 8 hectares of employment land per annum should be provided for in the period to 2031. This planning application is for 112 hectares, so exceeds what is required.

**Please note that ONS shows Warwickshire as essentially a full employment area so additional employment land is not required.**

Green Belt affords the greatest protection of land in planning terms. Therefore, development will only be permitted in the circumstances where national policy on Green Belt allows. how does this meet national policy and exceptional circumstances this does not meet those requirements

**Highways:** Ansty already suffers from severe congestion, so if the land is reclassified as employment land, with its proximity to the M6. Any pressure on the M6/M69 interlinks immediately results in incremental traffic to the village. Being a single carriageway it’s not appropriate to receive extra traffic. The planning application shows that an extra island will be built on Hinckley Road (B4065) to allow traffic into the site. This proximity to the village and the local park will endanger children accessing the park and cause increased congestion. (Highways Agency have submitted a response but am unable to download).

**Alternative sites:** All alternative sites have been discounted and no brown field sites considered.

**Noise:** “Once the land becomes employment land operational, there is potential for noise and vibration effects to arise from changes to road traffic volumes on existing roads and from operational noise from the Development itself.”

**Biodiversity and Geological Conservation:** Again, if the land becomes employment land the effect would lead to all hedges being removed which would have a disastrous effect on wild life and Biodiversity”

**The major Impact on the rural landscape:** The area surrounding Ansty and other local villages is already suffering from urban sprawl and impacting the look and feel of the area.

**Please explain to me** on the fact that a major planning application is imminent for the 275 acres around Junction 2, at the same time as Rugby are reviewing the local plan and that one of the proposals in the review is for the same parcel of land, to be re-classified as employment land and has already informed National Highways that the land between junction 2 and the Walsgrave Island iA46 is going to be commercial land how can this be right???

