

The Business, Economy and Enterprise Scrutiny Board (3)

Feedback on the Local Plan and City Centre Area Action Plan Periods of Public Consultation (January 18th 2016 – February 29th 2016)

Appendix of Notes and Responses

Date: 16th March 2016

Appendix 1 – Public Meeting and Ward Forum Presentation

The following appendix contains a copy of the presentation slides used at all Ward Forums and Public Meetings. Where appropriate it was also utilised at drop-in sessions.

Appendix 2 – Notes and Records of Public Meetings

The following appendix provides full notes and records of the public meetings held in support of the Publication drafts of the New Coventry Local Plan and the City Centre Area Action Plan (2016). These are recorded in date order.

Whilst every effort has been made to ensure records are accurate and recorded in full, it is acknowledged that there may be some small variations in wording or details of questions and answers.

Please note that where statements or discussions of a direct political nature were raised as part of these meetings they have not been recorded within these notes.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP public meeting – Tuesday 19th January 2016

St. Andrew's church, Eastern Green

Questions and comments from the audience

- 1. We are now back where we were in 2008 when there was a draft core strategy with two development areas – Keresley and Eastern Green. Eastern Green residents association opposed the plan and Eastern Green was removed. In 2009, Councillors voted in favour of Eastern Green being protected and not developed on.**

We are now in a period of greater housing need and different planning conditions etc – we have to prepare a Local Plan that tries to respond to that and plan positively. As part of this we had to look at all opportunities, including all sites considered before that were included and that were dismissed. We have also had to work closely with our neighbours if not we would fail the Duty to Cooperate. As such we have had to show them that we are serious about trying to provide for the city's housing needs and that we have looked robustly at delivering our housing growth. The Inspectors report made it clear that his views in 2009 were 'at that time'. The proposals now do not extend further west than the western edge of Coventry does now.

- 2. Developers made an application for Eastern Green to be developed on, but this was refused by a Planning Inspector. Formal designation of the Meriden gap was promised, but this didn't happen.**

The Meriden Gap has never formally been designated and I don't believe there are any plans to do this. The Inspectors findings (in 2009) made reference to the Meriden Gap but stopped short of suggesting a formal designation.

- 3. Development in Eastern Green would be detrimental to the area, causing light and noise pollution, and would be in conflict with national guidance.**

The Local Plan has taken full account of environmental impacts of development through a Sustainability Appraisal (this is available on our website). This has included consideration of noise and light pollution.

- 4. Don't understand why the Council thinks it can convince a planning inspector that development should take place on the land six years after it was refused.**

The city's need to promote this site for development now, responds to the significant growth in the city's housing needs.

- 5. Whilst aware of the need for more houses, there is no mention of the infrastructure that would be needed alongside any development. What about schools, one was promised with the Bannerbrook Park development, it didn't happen.**

We understand the issues of Bannerbrook Park and it is our understanding that there is plans for the school site there to come forward in the next few years. The Eastern Green proposal includes plans for a new primary school.

- 6. The decision has already been made, there have been developers surveying the site.**

The Council does not have surveyors out on site, the land owner or site promoters may have surveyors on the land but it is certainly not the Council.

- 7. Why is there a need for new houses? There are lots of vacant properties in the city, is the Council aware of how many vacant properties there are?**

There are just under 136,000 properties in the city. Of these 2.4% are considered vacant of which just 0.9% have been vacant for more than 6months (considered long term vacant). This is a reduction from 4% of total properties in 2004. The general standard of acceptable vacancy rates is 3% to allow for movement within the housing market. To start falling notably below this can be a sign of market strain.

- 8. The traffic in the area is horrendous already. Will the Council take any notice of the depth of feeling in the area?**

The consultation process and engagement will be recorded and form an important part of taking the Plan forward. The Council will have to take notice of all comments submitted as will the Planning Inspector. We will take all responses through scrutiny board before sending to the planning Inspector. We encourage you to respond and welcome your comments.

- 9. Don't believe that any new schools will be built, the Council intends to expand existing ones, not encourage new build.**

The Council has a legal responsibility to plan for new school provisions to support a growing population and education needs. At this time the Council has focused resources on extending and regenerating existing schools to support their role within local communities. There are examples around the

City though of new free schools being brought forward. The Local Plan will ensure that land is provided for new schools to support sustainable development.

10. The people of Eastern Green and Keresley should work together and should not be played off against each other.

No answer requested – comment noted

11. Cannot believe that traffic delays will only increase by 1.4 minutes, where does this information come from?

Assessment of traffic impacts has been undertaken on a worst case scenario basis using a detailed transport model. The model tells us what is happening on the roads at any given time but we do have to acknowledge that traffic changes daily in response to different scenarios or circumstances. The 2013 model has had all of the data and growth projections plugged into it, including that over the boundary in Warwickshire and considered what the position could be in 2031. It has also incorporated a number of highway improvements – e.g. the Keresley link road, junction onto A45 at Eastern Green and further improvements to south of the site and the east of the city on A46. The model doesn't alter the pattern of traffic i.e. the proportion of school trips undertaken by car (which is very high in Coventry) meaning the assumptions are more robust. We could have made assumptions about a reduction in such travel and reduced the projected impact on the highway further. In addition to the initial infrastructure we are also looking at different methods of travel to encourage more sustainable travel which would make the assumptions very safe. The devolution deal as part of the Combined Authorities work will also look to invest in infrastructure.

12. Why, after a previous successful campaign to stop development in the area, is there only a six week consultation period – is this to stop local people getting another campaign together?

This version of the Local Plan builds upon previous versions and drafts which have been presented, consulted on and developed over the last 10 years. The options associated with Eastern Green were discussed previously in 2008 and 2009 and again during the consultation in 2014. As such they have been on-going for some time and in their most recent format for over a year. The statutory period is 6 weeks which is also reflects our Statement of Community Involvement.

13. Previously there were 400 pages of responses to proposals for development in the area (2014 consultation responses), 70% were

against the plan and the other 30% had a vested interest. Most people are against development in Eastern Green.

We acknowledge that there were a large number of objections to the previous consultation in 2014 and that a large proportion of those originated for the Easter Green area of the city. We must consider all responses to consultation though as well as our evidence base and the need to deliver growth to the city. We have to consider these things in balance.

14. The Meriden gap is only mentioned sparsely in the plan; this is much cherished in Coventry. This is not about a city boundary, it's about greenspace.

The Meriden Gap is important and it is about green space, but it has never formally been defined, and is predominantly a perceived area of land that sits between Coventry and Greater Birmingham (with Meriden in the middle). In terms of its importance it is similar to other gaps on other edges of the city. It is part of the Green Belt. It is also important to remember that in this context that Green Belt is a policy designation that is there to ensure there is control of urban sprawl – it is not intended to stifle growth. The review of the Local Plan is the time to review the Green Belt boundaries which should have regard to defensible features. Pickford Green Lane is considered a permanent boundary which will help control urban sprawl.

15. If the plan goes ahead, Pickford Green Lane wouldn't cope, it's a minor road.

We do not expect traffic to flow out on to Pickford Green Lane. This is the reason that the primary access point is identified for the A45. Any traffic using Pickford Green Lane is likely to be restricted to public transport, cycling and pedestrians.

16. A simple change in traffic management led to journeys extended by 25 minutes at Parkhill Drive. More traffic uses the road due to people changing and rerouting. New houses and a supermarket in the area will increase delay time by more than 1.4 minutes, it's more likely to be 10-15 minutes.

The Local Plan makes specific provisions for new infrastructure but also sets out a fluid and evolving Infrastructure Delivery Plan. We will continue to work with local communities to mitigate existing highway pressures and ensure future development can help support new highways infrastructure.

At this time though, the city does benefit from a resilient highway network that contains existing capacity within it.

- 17. The plan has gone too far. We have other things we should focus on other than the aspiration to be a top ten city, the inner city areas need the most work. These areas should be improved. More homes and supermarkets in this area will just drive more people to Birmingham.**

The Local Plan continues to promote urban regeneration to improve the urban areas of Coventry at the same time as promoting sustainable growth and expansion. We cannot stop people who choose to go to other towns and cities to shop, but we can promote holistic growth and regeneration strategies which promote the sustainable growth of the city as a whole at the same time as investing in the city centre and improving its offer and appeal.

- 18. Parking at the Tile Hill Station is poor now; increased commuters will make this worse.**

We are looking at parking at Tile Hill station in partnership with Centro. The City centre AAP is also looking at parking infrastructure within the city centre, including at the station. We can only repeat that infrastructure is important to support the growth promoted in the Plans. Indeed the Plans will help enable us to deliver infrastructure and attract further investment and grant funding.

- 19. There are a number of unrealistic aspirations in the plan including use of vehicles per household, yet no park and ride, how will you reduce usage of cars. Pickford Way already takes 3,000 vehicles, this side of the city is already over congested, but unable to expand the Holyhead Road and Allesley Old Road sideways.**

The Local Plan does promote new infrastructure to try and reduce the reliance on the car and make provisions for a real and genuine alternative. This will require high quality public transport and improvements to how we link homes and jobs together through new development. The Plan does also allow for new park and ride provisions where they are shown to be appropriate and viable.

- 20. Pickford Green Lane would not provide a logical boundary; the other side of the road is the rugby club which is brownfield land, so nothing to stop development spread.**

The rugby ground at Pickford Green Lane is a sports pitch so therefore greenfield in nature. Notwithstanding this is not a primary consideration when identifying defensible Green Belt boundaries as Green Belt can cover Greenfield and brownfield land. It is more about the permanence of the road.

- 21. Since 2009, what has caused the significant increase in population? Would like a full breakdown in the notes please.**

There are a number of reasons that explain the increase in population. This includes a significant increase in birth rate and decrease in deaths meaning a strong growth in natural change. Internal migration patterns are changing with more people staying in Coventry etc. International migration rates are also increasing and are projected to increase over the plan period. This all comes together to generate a significant projected growth in the city's population.

A further response covering detailed figures was requested and this can be provided as follows:

The projected growth for the city is based on government data from the Office for National Statistics (ONS). It is trend based data that looks at natural change over the last 5 years and migration over the last 6. This data is then updated every 2 years as part of Sub-National Population Projections. The City is currently identified by the ONS as the fastest growing city outside of Greater London. This reflects significant population growth over the last decade. The 2009 plan looked to respond to this in part with the proposed release of Green Belt land at Keresley for example. The 2009 Plan was however based on ONS projections from 2004 and 2006, so older data. Since then the city's population has continued to grow, with 2012 based data now being considered. In terms of the components of the projected growth this is complicated by the different aspects of migration. When considered purely as a whole, migration is expected to contribute around 28% of growth and natural change 72%. As suggested though, the migration element is complicated by the different elements of migration. For example there is a projected loss of population through internal migration of around 55,000 people and a projected gain from international migration of around 76,000 people. This is again complicated by the fact it spans the whole plan period so those moving to Coventry at the start of the plan period as international migrants, may then leave the city for a different part of the Country as internal migrants at a later date. As such, and to clarify, the 2 key drivers of growth are natural change (approximately 55,000 people) and international migration (approximately 76,000 people). It is also worth noting though that although internal migration remains negative, it is showing a declining trend relative to previous data meaning more people are staying or moving to Coventry from elsewhere in Britain than has previously been the case.

22. Hockley Lane is not suitable for heavy vehicles, but the signs have been removed.

We are aware of HGV issues in the area as local councillors have raised them. We need to consider the opportunities that the growth could bring however in improving infrastructure to take such traffic away from

inappropriate roads. In these instances we can look at traffic regulations but enforcement is mainly down to police. We will look to replace the signage as soon as possible.

23. Schools aren't in the right place now, this will be worse with increased population.

The growth proposals in the Local Plan have been developed with our education colleagues to ensure an adequate amount of places are provided to support the new population. The Local Plan is also committed to ensuring schools are easily accessible and that new schools provide opportunities to act as hubs for their community.

24. The Local Plan is over 500 pages long, but all the evidence base is not available, yet is in other areas. Coventry was rebuilt between the wars, houses are now unsuitable for modern living, there are areas of high deprivation, this is a disgrace and needs to be sorted out. The only way to achieve this is to encourage and promote significant clearance of these areas and redevelop them for new homes. International migrants and students should be homed in the city centre. This would help increased usage of the centre which is failing due to retail parks. It seems that the Council want a Local plan that is rejected again, it's a waste of time and money. Please keep people updated.

The Plan itself is around 200 pages long, however we accept the evidence base is very long and covers a number of documents. The Green Belt review is on the Council's website and has been since the start of the consultation period (as has all other evidence documents). We accept that other councils have released this document sooner but this relates to their own Plan consultations. It is vitally important that the new Green Belt review is read in the right context alongside other evidence documents and not in isolation.

We are looking to provide a new centre in the north west of city as evidence demonstrates a need and it can help to facilitate sustainable development.

It is very difficult to promote mass clearance of new homes – especially where they are all in private ownership. This would involve a lengthy compulsory purchase order process and the rehousing of a large number of families and the likely decimation of established communities. There is also a density issue associated with new development and how many homes could be built in place of older terraced housing in particular. This is not considered a reasonable alternative approach to meeting the city's housing needs.

25. The joint greenbelt review should be available on the Council's website for people to consider in the context of Coventry and the context of

sustainability. The Council is restricting the release of information so that people can't use it usefully.

The Green Belt review is on the Council's website and has been since the start of the consultation period.

26. When the Council gives away greenbelt land, who are they representing?

Officers explained that it is their job to prepare the Local Plan for the city as a whole.

27. Residents in Appledore Drive paid a premium for their houses due to backing onto Green Belt, development will decrease the value of properties.

We understand residents' concerns regarding the impact of development on existing homes. Green Belt policy has never been about permanently restricting development though; it has been about controlling urban sprawl and the growth of key towns and cities. It is always subject to review through new Local Plans.

28. Will there be a buffer between houses and the development?

We would expect that the new urban extensions will be supported by detailed design guidance. This will include consideration of how new homes will relate to existing properties. This will include buffering, screening and landscaping.

29. Bought property because of the view and 10ft garden up to the back boundary. Asked an estate agent last year what effect development would have on property value, was told it would reduce it by £50k. Is there scope for residents to buy land to extend their properties?

We are aware of situations where this has happened, but it is a matter for individual property owners and wider landowners.

30. The Council has had lots of time to prepare the plan, this should be reciprocated to allow local communities sufficient time to respond. Indeed the Council owe it to the residents to extend the consultation to three months.

Members have approved a 6 weeks period of consultation for this stage of the Plan. This reflects national guidance and our own SCI. It also reflects many other consultation periods that have taken place on the development of the

Local Plan (and Core Strategy before it). If however, it becomes apparent that an extension is needed then it will be considered but we will not agree to it here and now. We would encourage you to comment within the period to ensure your comments are considered by the Inspector.

31. Are the Council prepared to release the full data sets associated with the SHMA – it's impossible to make informed choice without all the details?

There are 3 parts of the Strategic Housing Market Assessments (SHMA) on the Council's website, which summarise and highlight much of the data and trends. In addition, much of the raw data is already available through the ONS website.

Subsequently the detailed spread sheet showing the outcomes of the model has been released under an environmental Information Request. Reference: REQ00877

32. What alternatives to developing at Eastern green have been considered?

In developing the Local Plan the Council have considered the development potential of almost every blade of grass and every piece of concrete that exists across Coventry. This is covered in the SHLAA, which is available on the Council's website.

33. What would happen if the Council didn't build on greenbelt?

If we don't provide new homes in the city's Green Belt we have to find an alternative location to try and meet the city's housing needs. Whatever cannot be provided within Coventry needs to be met elsewhere and the inspector will ask the Council to explain this. At this time the Coventry and Warwickshire MOU responds to this by making provision for 17,800 of the city's housing needs within Warwickshire. If the city was not prepared to consider its own Green Belt then it could not justifiably expect its neighbours to consider theirs. Without considering our own Green Belt our neighbours would not be able to support the city's plan and this would lead to a failure of the Duty to Cooperate and the Plan as a whole.

34. Need better medical facilities to support new housing. Is the one being proposed for Eastern Green just the same as the one that was to be provided on Bannerbrook – i.e. it won't happen?

The recent development at Bannerbrook was a windfall scheme and developer led. It was not plan led like the schemes we are talking about now.

As such, infrastructure considerations were responsive instead of being proactive. As a result NHS England have reviewed their initial request and now feel they do not need a facility. The Local Plan looks holistically at health care and has been developed in partnership with NHS England to highlight where health care infrastructure will be needed. This includes the new site at Eastern Green.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP public meeting – Tuesday 26th January 2016

Whitley Academy, Whitley

Questions and comments from the audience

- 1. Are there any houses being planned at the back of Stonehouse Estate on the playing fields?**

There are no houses planned for this area, but the Plan does identify the area for an extension to Whitley Business Park.

- 2. Would that be JLR?**

Not necessarily, the policy hasn't been written to be specific to JLR.

- 3. The other side of the A45 may be Warwick but it affects us and we should have that information included in this Local Plan - why isn't it included?**

- 4. We recognise the importance of the proposals south of the A45 and can take this into account, but we can only consult on our own plans and proposals that effect land in Coventry's administrative area.**

- 5. There were plans previously to develop houses but it was put on the back burner due to ecology - this is the site where refugees were located after the war**

Ecology remains a known consideration on this site and is recognised in the Local Plan. It will also be taken into account when plans are coming forward at the application stage. Stonebridge Meadows Nature Reserve remains untouched and is outside of the allocation area. There will also be opportunities for developers to contribute financially to improving ecological sites to improve the environment. The plan encourages the protection and mitigation of ecology.

- 6. What plans are there for improvements to the highway infrastructure?**

There has already been considerable investment with the Toll Bar Island improvements. We have also modelled transport impacts and looked at a range of further highway infrastructure options as part of the Local Plan. There will be more opportunities to look at local road networks as applications evolve and would encourage you to feed such comments back.

7. Why are we building student accommodation in the city if we need so many houses, this impacts on Green Belt?

New student homes count towards the housing numbers and help provide a flexible and varied supply of housing options across the city.

8. The Nature Reserve is run by Coventry City Council but not appropriately maintained. The area is now closed off so people can't get into it. Up until 2008 the City Council owned the playing fields before they were leased to the school. Who now owns the land? The fields have now had fences erected around them without planning permission – is this allowed? We were told that the land had to be reserved for Sports. The whole site is landlocked and the animals are on the site due to it being landlocked. Why can't the playing fields move to the Severn Trent site that Wasps were looking at?

The issues of the land being landlocked will be considered further as the Plan evolves. Ecology remains a known consideration on this site and is recognised in the Local Plan. It will also be taken into account when plans are coming forward at the application stage. The playing fields are looking to be relocated to the north-west of the city in partnership with the school, and the Local Plan facilitates this. When we propose site allocations we don't look at landownership, we need to focus on where development is best located, ensuring it is sustainable with housing and employment linked together. Site allocations are not influenced by land ownership. We also expect the natural environment to be enhanced through the proposals as a result of offsetting investment, which will respond to how important the area is.

9. Why do you need to invest in a river - its already there?

Any investment would be to help encourage additional wildlife and mitigate/offset any impacts of development on surrounding land – This will help us to create an overall improvement to biodiversity.

10. Are there plans to build on the area between Leaf Lane and Cheylsemore Bypass?

No, this land is identified as a new Local Green Space designation.

11. Why are you re-designating Green Belt to Local Green Space

Green Belt is a policy designation rolled out in the 1940's. It seeks to control growth of the city and its main aim is to prevent the merging of settlements. Following our Green Belt review it was clear that many areas in the city didn't meet the purposes of Green Belt as it would be preventing the merging of Coventry with Coventry. Local Green Space designation seeks to protect the

land due to its quality and importance to the community. As such this is identified as a more appropriate policy designation.

12. The NPPF doesn't support the Local Authority designating land as Local Green Space - it is a community responsibility. This tool is specifically aimed at local communities, so the current proposals do not meet the requirements of the NPPF. Also why have you called them local urban green spaces?

If urban is included that is an error and will be corrected. The designation doesn't preclude the local community coming forward with more land to be designated as Local Green Space. It is a tool for local communities and a planning policy tool for Local Authorities. Indeed the NPPF is clear that such designations can be identified through Local Plans and/or Neighbourhood Plans. In Coventry we have used the consultation feedback we have received to help inform our Local Plan alongside other evidence around land quality etc. The land doesn't meet the purposes of Green Belt and therefore could come under pressure from development; this designation will provide a more appropriate level of protection in the future.

13. The speed of action to protect is slower than the speed of action to develop. There has been no protection over the last 12-18 months and no consultation on developments that are taking place.

There has been consultation over a significant period of time. We appreciate it may not seem so, but discussions have been going on city wide and within local communities on more detailed aspects for nearly a decade. All comments will be consolidated and sent to the planning inspectorate for consideration. We are keen to prepare design guidance for areas of urban growth which we're happy for local communities to be involved in.

14. What kind of people are the houses for? Will it be for local people?

Yes. New homes will be for a range of different people and respond to a range of different aspects of the city's housing needs. For example we have an issue with overcrowding and a need to deliver homes for first time buyers and young people trying to get on the housing ladder. We also need to provide larger homes to retain people in the city as we are currently well below the national average for the number of detached homes for example. We also have a high number of properties in council tax bands A and B so we need to diversify our housing offer. We also need to continue providing high quality affordable homes.

15. No qualms with Whitley, but a lot of people moving into the area need schools etc. What will be done to support the planned growth?

The Local Plan is quite clear that new development will need to be infrastructure led. We have worked very closely with NHS England, education colleagues and highways officers to ensure the Plan includes the needs for new schools, health care facilities and highways infrastructure.

16. How will you access the land at JLR? What will the buildings be like?

There have recently been significant investments in Whitley island area to support access to JLR. The plans to the south of the A45 also include significant highways investment.

At this stage we do not know what the buildings will be like. This will be considered at the planning application stage.

17. You need to think 100 years ahead not only 20 years.

The plan is a 20 year plan, based on a robust evidence base. There are significant challenges with planning 15-20 years ahead. To look further afield is increasingly difficult.

18. The city centre is poor as everything goes to the outskirts.

This is something the Area Action Plan looks to address by planning to improve the retail and leisure offer and encourage more people to live and work in the city centre making it more vibrant and viable.

19. Student accommodation is poorly designed.

We acknowledge that some cases have been controversial in recent years. Our City centre AAP does promote high quality design for new city centre developments though (including student residential schemes) and will provide us with a policy platform to ensure it happens.

20. Car parking in the city centre is too expensive and stops people coming in.

City Centre Area Action Plan is looking at car parking strategy and improving the car parking offer. Current car parks are well used.

21. Is there any intention to build on the Sowe Valley? Isn't the footpath protected against building

Existing footpaths will either be retained where they are or planned to be diverted as part of the application stage. The Sowe Valley will be protected and enhanced where investment opportunities materialise.

22. Moved here due to the amount of open space in the area. The planned building is not spread out around the city. Can't other sites be identified across the city? The site identified will be a noose around the nature conservation.

As part of the Local Plan we have assessed all undeveloped land in the city and have had to be mindful of the need to make provision for as much development in the city as possible, particularly if we want our neighbours to plan for some of our growth. As such, there is a significant distribution of homes and jobs planned around the city as a whole.

23. Can't the Whitley site be a mixed development of housing and employment

This option was considered but Employment opportunities seem more suited to a growth of the Whitley business park and an opportunity to respond to its recent success. Its also an opportunity to provide land for new jobs that are accessible to the local area. Furthermore, employment developments are generally less dense than housing developments meaning greater opportunity to retain and invest in the higher value green spaces on site.

24. Where will people walk etc, will it be fenced off? This will lead to depression

That is detailed matter for consideration through the planning application stage. Public Health issues are an important aspect of the Local Plan as is the provision of green infrastructure and access to it.

25. Will the Combined Authority stop this happening

The Combined Authority will not impact on this Local Plan. If anything the process will help support infrastructure investment through the devolution deal.

26. How will you ensure JLR will not continue to park on the residential estates, will you ensure the end user(s) provide sufficient parking?

The Local Plan includes policies for parking standards which we are consulting on. Any current applications will be considered on the basis of

current policy so we need to get this Plan through to help bring into force better standards of parking.

27. This plan doesn't present the whole picture - what about the areas identified in the plan to be released if Warwick come forward with development?

The land in Warwick district is the responsibility of Warwick District to plan for through their Local Plan. We cannot allocate land in other local authority areas or pre-empt what proposals may be formally put forward by other authorities.

The proposals set out in draft policy GB" therefore aim to future proof our plan as the land would become Green Belt islands not fulfilling Green Belt purposes if land within Warwick District were to be developed. They are school playing fields and woodland - both important infrastructure assets and we would expect these to be retained and if anything enhanced.

28. Why can't the areas adjacent to Warwick be designated as local green space so they are secured in the future.

The land forms part of a wider area designated as Green Belt. If Warwick then bring forward development on their land then our land would need to be reconsidered and if not future proofed now we would have to review our Local Plan to do this. This reflects the policy basis of Green Belt.

29. Properties in Chace Avenue have been knocked down where is the sense in that

The site in question was the site of the former Chace Hostel which was in a poor state of repair. The Salvation Army have built a replacement scheme near to the city centre. New social housing will be built on the site of the former hostel.

30. Are you talking to Warwick to discuss what their plans are? Coventry has its own identity which makes Coventry special, this needs retaining for future generations

The Plan has to be developed under the Duty to cooperate, which means we have to work closely with our neighbouring authorities. Our Local Plan does highlight the strategic gaps between the city and other towns - such as Rugby, Kenilworth, Leamington and greater Birmingham.

31. Is the aspiration of Coventry City Council to change the balance of Coventry housing - i.e. do you want to provide more housing for the wealthy

We are trying to make provision for a range of housing. There is a clear need to diversify the city's housing stock as 71% of homes are currently classed as Council tax bands A or B. This compares to the national average of 43%. Our evidence tells us we need at least 60% of new homes to be larger family homes with 3 or more beds.

32. The failure to implement an Article 4 direction on HiMO's has resulted in the loss of family housing.

The Local Plan makes provisions for new purpose built student accommodation which will help respond to significant growth in both universities and help ease the pressure on family housing. We also have to be mindful that Article 4 directions are not retrospective and can in the short term at least accelerate issues due to a need for advertising prior to implementation.

33. The Council needs to make sure it operates with foresight and gets the big decisions right. Local people are cynical due to things like digging up Ironmonger Row without checking underground services; resurfacing the area between council house and broad gate and the use of all spaces in park and ride south by STW staff. You need to get it right, if you get it wrong you will get flack.

Many developments over the last 5-10 years which have come forward have not been plan led - this is due to there not being an up to date Local Plan in place. The plan allows us to be forward thinking and proactive. This consultation allows you to respond to these proposals and help them evolve over time.

34. Do you care about the residents of the Stonehouse estate – the green spaces we have are now fenced off so they can't be used

In most cases this is a result of the schools closing them off to protect children from anti-social behaviour. We can try to strengthen green infrastructure through the Local Plan and development proposals to ensure it becomes more publicly accessible.

35. How do you get over the very special circumstances argument of taking land out of the Green Belt

Very Special Circumstances primarily need to be demonstrated where land is in the Green Belt and proposed for development. It is a different approach with Local Plans as these are a vehicle for redefining Green Belt boundaries. The city's need for housing and employment land and the need to promote sustainable growth and development for the city as a whole are considered very special circumstances in the preparation of the Plan.

36. At what point in this process can residents come forward with their own ideas / proposals - neighbourhood plans?

You can challenge this Local Plan at this stage by responding to the consultation - identify the policy and include details of what you want to propose. These will then be considered through the examination process. All comments are sent to Inspectorate to help support and facilitate this if required.

There is a policy in the Local Plan that supports the preparation of Neighbourhood Plans. Indeed there is 1 already being developed in Willenhall and 1 starting at Allesley.

37. What site area is exactly allocated at Whitley?

A map was presented showing the detailed red line area.

38. Are you going to build more schools and make existing schools bigger?

We will continue to look at opportunities to expand existing schools and the Plan does include some proposals for this. There is also land set aside within the Plan for new schools in areas such as Eastern Green and Keresley.

39. You are encouraging us to comment, but you said the Inspector will be looking at the legal compliance and soundness test so really there isn't opportunity to have our say

Yes there is. Comments should be focused on legal compliance and soundness issues and ideally submitted using the standard forms on our website. There are also guidance notes to support this approach. All comments will be going to the Inspector and be considered through the public examination process. If we receive comments that we feel should result in a change to the plan we can make proposals for those changes to be made.

40. If all this goes ahead, what is the situation about funding and timescale

Not all development will happen overnight – this is a Plan for the next 15 years. The market will bring development forward as and when there is demand. The Local Authority may have some grant funding which can help with infrastructure delivery – and it has been very successful in recent years in attracting such funding – but essentially housing and employment will be delivered through the market.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP public meeting – Wednesday 3rd February 2016

President Kennedy School, Keresley

Questions and comments from the audience

1. Why is Keresley taking the majority of housing?

The land at Keresley is proposed for 3,100 homes. In comparison areas such as Foleshill could accommodate in excess of 2000 homes, the City centre has proposals for 3,500 homes. We appreciate there is a large number proposed for Keresley but it is not in isolation.

2. We don't want to become another Cumbria. How will the Local Plan deal with flooding issues?

Neither do we. Through developing the Local Plan we are required to work very closely with the Environment agency under the duty to Cooperate. As part of this work we have completed a new Flood Risk Assessment which looks at the possible impacts of new developments on flood risk and water courses. The Local Plan also includes specific flood risk policies which look to prevent development from taking place in flood plains.

3. Can you clarify where the population/housing figures come from – rang the Office of National Statistics, not clear these are exact.

Our housing need has been evidenced through our joint Housing Market Assessment work that has been completed by GL Hearn planning consultants on behalf of the 6 Coventry and Warwickshire authorities. The research is founded on the most up to date population data from the ONS and is considered to offer a robust evidence base.

4. How will you deal with the infrastructure? Particularly bearing in mind the situation at the hospital recently.

The Local Plan makes positive provisions for new infrastructure. As part of new developments new health centres are proposed at Keresley and Eastern Green. We have worked with NHS England and the appropriate Clinical Commissioning Group to ensure the planned growth of Coventry is considered when planning for future services.

5. The Local Plan talks about being a 'top ten city', but in terms of what?

The aim to reinstate itself as a top ten city is founded on promoting investment in jobs and the city economy and promoting further investment and growth in areas that will help support that – including housing, retail, leisure, health and wellbeing and education. The Council's Corporate Strategy and Local Plan set out a range of indicators and objectives that support the aim of becoming a top ten city again.

6. Why is the consultation period not longer than the six weeks minimum for consultation?

The Local Plan consultation period has been identified to reflect national guidance and the Council's Statement of Community Involvement. It is also reflective of the vast majority of previous consultation exercises we have undertaken on the Local Plan (and Core Strategy before it).

7. How will you engage with communities regarding the design of the houses/ Can we trust the Council to do this?

The Council is looking to prepare work on design guidance specifically for the proposed urban extensions. We will be looking to start this work in the spring and look to involve local communities once we have some ideas and proposals to consider further.

8. What will you do to protect wildlife in the area?

The Local Plan contains policies that protect local wildlife sites and nature reserves etc. In deed the Plan is committed to protecting the city's most valuable assets and promotes improvements to biodiversity and ecology across the city as a whole. For example the site allocation at Keresley contains a specific need to protect and enhance the ancient woodlands that sit within the allocated area.

9. Of the 3,100 houses, will the Council dictate the pricing structures to developers to change the wealth in the city?

Unfortunately this is not a planning issue.

10. What about local facilities, particularly faith schools?

The Local Plan makes numerous proposals for new infrastructure, especially related to specific sites. The allocations at Eastern Green and Keresley for example require a need for new schools. We acknowledge that these could be new free schools or academies in line with current national policy.

11. Does Pro-logis Park officially sit within Coventry?

The boundary between Coventry and Nuneaton and Bedworth council areas runs through the middle of Pro-Logis Park. As sit half sits in Coventry and half in Nuneaton. Any growth proposals would be on land in Nuneaton and Bedworth.

12. How temporary is the road on Watery Lane?

At this time the road being used off of Watery Lane is temporary to facilitate construction works at the school.

13. Why isn't the housing spread more evenly around the city?

The land at Keresley is proposed for 3,100 homes. In comparison areas such as Foleshill could accommodate in excess of 2000 homes, the City centre has proposals for 3,500 homes. We appreciate there is a large number proposed for Keresley but it is not in isolation.

14. The Council has not been robust enough in the past in protecting wildlife – e.g. Bennett's Road.

This is one of the key reasons we need an up to date Plan in place to give us the best policy basis for protecting local wildlife and ecology.

15. The maps which support the Plan are not detailed enough.

We apologise if maps are not sufficiently clear. We have produced a policies map which shows the key allocation areas and other designations. This is reasonably well presented when zoomed in online. If there are specific issues though, or points of clarity please email us or write to us and we will be happy to discuss them further.

16. Why are being ignored? We have been here before.

It is not a case of being ignored. We know that the land at Keresley has been considered previously, and indeed was supported in 2009. This Plan has been prepared with a view to delivering the needs of the city in the most sustainable and appropriate way.

17. What will you do to stop traffic being gridlocked?

The Plan has been informed by a strategic highways assessment which has considered a worst case scenario in terms of highway impact. It has also

filtered in a range of infrastructure proposals. The results of the study show a manageable impact on the city's network, which absorbs some of the existing capacity and benefits from what is already a fairly resilient network. Where there are issues these will be targeted through new infrastructure investment. This will be an evolving process though to ensure sustainable growth is supported.

18. Are you willing to have a public and evenly balanced debate on the numbers?

We have done before and are happy to continue doing so. Indeed we would expect the housing numbers to be discussed at the public examination.

19. There have been a large number of developments where there has been no infrastructure or what's provided has been poor.

The Local Plan will look to overcome these concerns. It will help ensure new development is plan led instead of responding to 'windfall proposals'. By windfall we mean developments that come forward without an allocation and that are market driven. Bannerbrook is a prime example.

The Local Plan is clear that infrastructure will form a vital part of ensuring new development is sustainable.

20. Coventry is becoming overrun by students and student housing.

We acknowledge that both universities have grown significantly in the last decade. The city is however very lucky to have 2 world class universities that create such a benefit for the local economy. The recent upturn in new student homes is a market response to the sustained growth in the city's student population.

21. What about Sandpits Lane – what is happening there?

Sandpits Lane would be the southern edge of the new Keresley development proposals.

22. Will Jubilee Woods end up with a road through it?

The Jubilee Wood is an important piece of Green Infrastructure. There is land set aside for a road to go through the site, which we believe is currently being used to support construction traffic. There are proposals for a new link road to run near the woodlands, but it will not lead to any damage to the woodland.

23. Will there be compensation for the people who live in the new houses when they flood?

The Local Plan is supported by a Strategic Flood Risk Assessment.

Unfortunately property compensation as a result of development is not a planning issue.

24. There is apparently capacity for 25,000 houses in Coventry, 7-8,000 of these will need to be in the Green Belt but it has been said there is a chance we might not need that many. So, can we leave developing on the Green Belt until the end in case we don't need all the land predicted?

The City Council have a strong track record of developing brownfield sites and supporting urban regeneration, especially in the last 20 years. The Local Plan promotes the continuation of this but in the context of wider growth as well. At this time, the council has a strong 5 year housing land supply of predominantly brownfield land. As such, there are no plans at this time to build on any Green Belt land within the next 5 years. Indeed before any development is brought forward it will need to be supported by necessary infrastructure.

25. Communication could be better, if more people knew about the proposals, more people would oppose it.

Whenever we undertake public consultation we look to learn from issues raised at previous events and improve the work we do to get greater input and ensure greater dialogue with stakeholders. As part of this process we have planned and advertised a wide range of public meetings and drop-in sessions – more than we have ever done before. We have also ensured a large number of post cards have been sent to residents in close proximity to site specific proposals and ensured both plans are advertised in local media. We are as confident as we can be that the vast majority of people in the city are aware of the Local Plan and City Centre proposals.

26. Why isn't any of Keresley given extra protected status?

The majority of land at Keresley (between Tamworth Road and Bennetts Road) is allocated for housing development. Within that allocation though are areas of ancient woodland which are protected by other policies and other areas of important wildlife value, which are again protected by other policies. The land is not proposed to be protected by Green Belt or Local Green Space at this time as it is proposed for development. Notwithstanding, as development of the area evolves there are likely to be important natural

features such as the Hall Brook corridor or the woodlands which could be designated as Local Green Spaces as part of a comprehensive designation for the area in the next Plan review.

27. How will the Local Plan be implemented, will we have 15 years of doubt and worry about whether new houses will be built next to us?

We expect the homes proposed in the Plan to form part of a 15 year growth programme for Coventry. They will not all happen overnight and will be infrastructure led. When we are talking about developing 3,000 homes over the plan period though, works could begin sooner rather than later, but it is not clear at this stage when that would be.

28. What will happen to the public rights of way in the Green Belt area?

Existing footpaths will either be retained where they are or planned to be diverted as part of the application stage.

29. There will no longer be access to the countryside, it will all be a building site, or houses.

The city is surrounded by countryside and will retain a strong degree of access to it. Within this area at Keresley new development will only cover approximately half the land within the allocated area, meaning a strong degree of green infrastructure will be retained. This will be publicly accessible and useable green spaces.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP public meeting – Tuesday 9th February 2016

Xcel Leisure Centre, Canley

Questions and comments from the audience

- 1. The Council has said it will not promote development that extends the city beyond its existing western boundary. Surely this site at Cromwell Lane extends the city beyond its existing western edge?**

The site at Cromwell Lane still sits within the western built edge of the city, especially when the inclusion of the planned woodland buffer is incorporated. No developments within the Local Plan extended beyond the most western built point of Coventry

- 2. The allocation of this site surely has an impact on the Meriden Gap, as noted by the Inspector in 2009.**

The Inspectors comments were based on a lack of defensible boundary and a sprawling agricultural field that continued into Solihull borough. As such, there was no identified way of controlling development or urban sprawl. We accept that there is always an argument that any development within land currently designated as Green Belt will have an impact, however that impact needs to be minimised and considered in the context of development need and land suitability. In this case it is our view that the creation of a woodland buffer to act as a defensible boundary and shield development from the wider Green belt will help remove the impact on the wider Meriden Gap and retain an appropriate buffer to Balsall Common.

- 3. What is the difference between this site and other sites to the north around eastern green (west of Pickford Green Lane).**

In the case of Eastern Green, Pickford Green Lane has been identified as a defensible boundary to the western edge. Beyond that the land sprawls in less of a controlled way and extends beyond the western most point of the city's existing urban area.

- 4. In 2009 the inspector overseeing the previous Core Strategy examination recommended the removal of site at Cromwell lane from the Plan – what has changed.**

The planned provision of the defensible boundary will be included in policy to create a clear boundary between the new development and the wider Green Belt. We believe this will help overcome some of the Inspectors concerns from 2009. There has also been a significant uplift in the city's housing need which needs to be responded to and planned for in order to bring a Plan forward.

- 5. How does combined authority affect the planning system.**

It will have no effect as at this time, planning will not be part of the combined authority remit.

6. How much of the site make up the 10% of Greenbelt?

We are unsure of the exact figure. The 10% figure relates to the removal of Green Belt land across the whole city

Following the public meeting we have reviewed our database and can confirm that the land at Cromwell Lane would account for approximately 14ha of the land proposed to be removed from the Green Belt. This accounts for just under 4% of the land that makes up the total 10%.

7. Have you spoken to Solihull council about the Cromwell Lane site? Have they supported the Plan?

We are required to engage regularly with Solihull MBC in the development of our Plans, which relates to our Duty to Cooperate. Solihull have not raised any concerns in relation to the proposals included in the Plans.

8. Can you explain how these new sites will be brought forward and phased. The Housing Trajectory shows the Cromwell Lane site coming forward first.

The Housing Trajectory provided in appendix 1 is provided as an Indicative guide to how and when sites may come forward. This is especially true for the sites that currently sit within the Green Belt as their exact timing will depend upon the outcomes of the Examination and how sites are brought forward afterwards.

9. How does the Plan consider the traffic on Cromwell lane? It is currently very busy with traffic travelling between Balsall Common, and other areas, to the University and Business Park.

Strategic transport modelling has been carried out to support the proposed Plans and sits within the Evidence Base. This evidence has been developed on a worst case scenario basis and shows that the highway network would cope with the additional traffic. The IDP sets out a plan for infrastructure improvements including road, public transport walking and cycling networks.

We will continue to monitor existing traffic issues and promote ways to overcome existing pressures.

10. What specifically is the impact of development traffic on Cromwell lane

The model is strategic and looks at the highway network as a whole as opposed to individual locations in detail. The figures for trip generation and movement could theoretically be pulled off to determine trips rates and flow of travel from the site, but this would be theoretical and would require some further analysis as part of a planning application. This would be carried out at

the application stage through a Transport Assessment to determine in more detail the impact of traffic and whether mitigation is required. This will need to consider exact points of access etc. There is also a need to understand the impacts of the Tile Hill train station car park and the movements to that car park. The opening of the Kenilworth station for example could reduce pressure, whilst an expansion of the existing car park could also change patterns of usage and relieve pressure from on street parking.

11. Where will the point of access for the Cromwell lane site be? Wherever it is, is likely to be inadequate to deal with the traffic.

There are several options for access to the site. All the Local Plan needs to be satisfied with is that the site could be accessible in an appropriate way and we believe that this is the case.

12. We need to make sure that sufficient infrastructure is provided in advance of development. We need new improved roads, dual carriageways – look to remove the conflict of side roads on the A45 through grade separation.

These comments were noted and attention was drawn to the Infrastructure Delivery Plan. We completely support the need for infrastructure led development. Unfortunately the grade separation of parts of the A45 to the west of the city, especially at Kenilworth Road and Broad Lane are not achievable or viable.

13. Where will the defensible boundary be to the wider Green Belt

As part of the Cromwell Lane development a new woodland buffer will be planted to define the boundary to the wider Green Belt. This will sit along the current administrative boundary to Solihull.

14. What is the situation with the land to north of railway line

The land north of the railway line along Duggins Lane is not promoted for development due to concerns over flood risk.

15. What will be the distance between the defensible boundary and housing?

We do not know this level detail at this stage. This will need to be considered further through the planning application process and/or design guidance document that we are looking to repaper for areas of Green Belt development.

16. Are there plans for a new road out the back of Warwick University

There are no plans for this within our Local Plan as the land sits with Warwick District Council. We are aware of this as a possibility though and that there is scope within the Warwick Infrastructure Plan to upgrade the Stoneleigh Road junction with the A46.

17. Health facilities are currently inadequate in the area. Can you tell us what the Plan does to provide for new health facilities to support a growing population?

We are required to work with NHS England to ensure adequate health care facilities are planned for to support new development. Based on this work there are no facilities planned for the south west corner of the city. There is however a new facility to be provided as part of the Eastern Green development which could influence catchment areas for GP services and create additional capacity within existing facilities in the South west corner of the city.

18. The land at Cromwell Lane and Duggins Lane currently suffer from flooding issues which should be addressed.

Flooding and water cycle assessment have been carried out to support the Local Plan. These have analysed site specific issues and specific water courses to understand the impacts of development. This is a fundamental requirement of the Duty to Cooperate work we are required to do with the Environment Agency.

19. Given the need to build in excess of 42,000 houses between 2011 and 2031, how can the council dramatically increase the level of house building compared to current levels of around 1,000 per year. This will require a doubling of the rate of house building.

Within our administrative boundary we are planning for 25,000 homes which require up to 1300 homes a year. Over the last 5 years we have seen steady increases year on year in house building and have exceeded 1000 new homes a year for the last 3 years. As such we will need to release a wider portfolio of land to help stimulate the housing market further but there is strong demand in Coventry and we would expect these targets to be met.

20. There is a significant problem in the area with car parking, especially linked to the train station.

We are continuing to engage with Centro to find ways to overcome the issues associated with the train station. In addition the Plan highlights the opportunity to designate a residents parking scheme as part of the new development and roll it out to the immediate surrounding area as well to help provide a shorter term solution.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP public meeting – also part of the Westwood Ward Forum – Tuesday 16th February 2016

Xcel Leisure Centre, Canley

Questions and comments from the audience

1. Do we receive EU Funding and Heritage Lottery funding for this?

Yes, the Council is able to attract grant funding to support infrastructure delivery.

2. Why is it taking so long to reach a decision on the land at Mitchell Avenue.

The site is complicated by lease issues. The site is proposed for allocation in the Local Plan but is subject to the provision of replacement sports pitches.

3. Could someone find out what was happening to the city's bowls facilities as there are no provisions for them once the old sports centre is demolished?

This will be explored further through the city's Sports Strategy. The City Centre AAP talks positively about providing sports facilities and provisions within the city centre and if there is scope to provide new facilities we will look at doing so.

4. A straw poll was held to see if anyone was positive about the plan.

- No one raised their hand to say they were positive
- Approximately half the residents raised their hand to say they were not in favour.
- Approximately half the residents did not vote.

5. How do we respond to the Local Plan and when by?

Responses can be submitted via the website or on one of the standard response forms. These can be sent to us via post or email or given to an officer at a subsequent drop-in session.

Responses should be provided by the 29th February 2016

6. Where can we view a copy of the Local Plan?

The Local Plan can be viewed on the Council's website or at any of the city's libraries. It can also be viewed at Civic Centre 4 and The Council House.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP public meeting – also part of the Longford Ward Forum –Wednesday 17th February 2016

Bell Green Community Centre, Bell Green

Questions and comments from the audience

1. How will the Local Plan ensure there will be enough school places locally?

Planning officers are working with the council's Education department on this matter to ensure schools in the existing area have capacity to provide for new homes. Where shortfalls occur new provisions will be promoted.

2. Will there be any provision for eco-friendly housing?

The Local Plan does encourage high quality sustainable housing that goes above and beyond existing building standards.

3. Is the Council's "zoning" of the city centre the correct way forward?

The city centre will be more mixed than the "zoning" terminology indicates. For instance the Friargate area will include retail, residential and leisure provision as well as business. The titles and policy guidance mainly provide a focus for each area to evolve around.

4. Will the Plan be subject to a robust design code?

Yes, we are already working towards specific design guidance for new developments, especially those within areas of urban expansion.

5. What will the Local Plan do about public transport links, especially buses

The Council shares these concerns. We will work with bus operators to try and ensure that we can get the best outcome on bus routes for all parts of the city.

6. Older people and those with mobility problems have problems getting around the city centre – what will the Action Plan do about this?

The Council is looking at diverting some bus routes, and there already a number which travel up to Ironmonger Row to improve accessibility and overcome the issues at Trinity Street. Also, the City Centre South development will change the focus of the city centre and may help with these issues.

7. Does the re-designation of Green Belt land to Local Green Space reduce its protection?

No, these areas will continue to be protected under the Local Green Space policy. This policy reflects the quality and value of the land to local communities instead of the purposes of Green Belt. This ensures land within the city has the most appropriate designation moving forward.

- 8. Where people have parking facilities to the rear of their residence they should be forced to use them and reduce on street parking.**

Unfortunately the Council cannot enforce this approach to parking.

- 9. When providing new cycle paths every care should be taken to ensure these are high quality and correctly located.**

Comment noted and agreed. The Local Plan promotes high quality accessible cycle routes around the city.

Appendix 3 – Notes and records of Ward Forums

The following appendix contains the notes and records of the ward forums where presentations were given by Council officers in relation to the Local Plan and City Centre Area Action Plan. Copies of the notes from the Westwood and Longford Ward Forums are also included despite a summary being provided in Appendix 2 also (in relation to the advertised public meeting).

Notes are also provided from the Ward Forums where the Local Plan and/or Area Action Plan (in full or part) were discussed informally. These are highlighted as appropriate.

Please note that at this time these records have not been formally signed off by the respective Ward Forums as a true record. They are provided purely as an informative guide to support this submission.

Date of Ward Forum	Ward	Notes Included
Thursday 21 st January	Holbrook	Not yet
Wednesday 27 th January	Bablake	Not yet
Thursday 28 th January	Foleshill	Not yet
Thursday 28 th January	Upper Stoke	In Part
Tuesday 9 th February	Cheylesmore	Not yet
Wednesday 10 th February	Sherbourne	Not yet
Thursday 11 th February	Whoberley	Not yet
Thursday 11 th February	Woodlands	Not yet
Tuesday 16 th February	Westwood	Yes
Wednesday 17 th February	Binley and Willenhall	Not yet
Wednesday 17 th February	Longford	Yes
Thursday 18 th February	Wyken	Not yet
Wednesday 24 th February	Radford	Not yet
Wednesday 24 th February	Henley	Not yet
Thursday 25 th February	Lower Stoke	Not yet
Thursday 25 th February	Earlsdon	Not yet

Appendix 4 – Notes and records of other meetings

Meeting with Coventry Society – Monday 8th February 2016

Meeting focused primarily on the city's historic environment.

The Coventry Society have summarised their February meeting and their views on the Local Plan in their March newsletter which can be downloaded from the following link: <http://www.coventrysociety.org.uk/newsletters.html> . This also includes references to current city centre development schemes.

Meeting with the Coventry Accessible Transport Group – Friday 12th February 2016

The meeting was generally positive and focused on the opportunities to access the city centre from new developments as well as design, connectivity and access to community facilities and services. There was also a desire to see more homes built within the city centre and a wider range of accommodation for older persons and those with disabilities. In particular it was suggested that the city centre should not just be for students.

Final detailed notes will be included when received from The Coventry Accessible Transport Group

Meeting with Coventry Tree Wardens Network – Monday 22nd February 2016

Officers attended one of the regular meetings of the Coventry Tree Wardens Network to discuss with them the Local Plan proposals, with a specific focus on how it will impact on the city's tree and hedgerow provisions, as well as general green space policy.

Key areas of discussion included:

- The benefits trees can have to other aspects of policy are not clear. For example the Plan would benefit from wider cross referencing to Environmental Management and air quality, mental health and wellbeing, flood risk, development viability, design and historic environments.
- Ancient woodlands were discussed and the group asked for clarification around how they will be protected, especially where they are close to planned development such as the Keresley SUE.
- References to Ancient woodlands in Policy GE3 and HE2 were noted. The group also asked though that GE3 in particular be strengthened to make reference to more modern planted woodlands that add value now, but will add increasing value as they mature over time.

- Appendix 3 was also highlighted as needing clarification to show it only covers larger Ancient Woodlands over 2 acres in size.
- Building on these points it was suggested that the Jubilee Woodland at Watery Lane be referenced within the site allocation proposals for the Keresley SUE and also be highlighted as a prime example of a more modern woodland within Coventry.
- The Local Plan should give greater consideration to the future maintenance of new trees and green spaces. It was discussed that new developments often put infrastructure in place but then abandon future maintenance meaning they don't maximise their benefits. It was acknowledged that clearer references to this could be made within the IDP.
- Paragraph 1 of the explanatory text after Policy GE4 was discussed. Reference to the word minimum was queried and it was acknowledged that this was not the correct term.

Appendix 5 – Notes and Records of Drop-in Sessions

The following appendix provides a summary record of the drop-in sessions held in support of the Publication drafts of the New Coventry Local Plan and the City Centre Area Action Plan (2016). These are recorded in date order.

Whilst every effort has been made to ensure an accurate summary is provided of the points discussed, it was not possible to make a full detailed record of all the points raised due to the practicality of record making whilst responding to regular questioning and inquiries.

Please note that where statements or discussions of a direct political nature were raised as part of these meetings they have not been recorded within these notes.

The summary points covered in this appendix should not be read as the views or thoughts of the City Council or its officers.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP Drop-in sessions – Thursday 4th February – Saturday 6th February 2016 (3 sessions)

Market Way, City Centre

Questions and comments from attendees

Feedback from City Centre Drop-in session Thursday 4th February 2016

The enquires focused predominantly on the delivery of student accommodation and the growth of the universities. Other comments focused on public realm improvements, car parking in the city centre and Green Belt development proposals.

Summary of comments below:

- Can you explain why we are seeing so many new student properties being built and proposed?
- Can you explain why the Axa building was allowed to be decorated in the way it has been – this is not good design
- Will new student developments be better quality than that?
- Do the Plans make provisions for non-student homes in the city centre
- Are there going to be more public realm improvements to build on the success of recent schemes?
- What will the Area Action Plan do to improve car parking in the city centre?
- Why do we need to propose new homes on the Green Belt? What about derelict land being used first?

Feedback from City Centre Drop-in session Friday 5th February 2016

The enquiries ranged from development of Green Belt land in Eastern Green, Keresley and Walsgrave Hill Farm to detailed discussions around population

projections, highways impacts and student housing. Green infrastructure and the protection of the city's trees were discussed as was the relationship between Coventry City and Warwick District in terms of house building, employment land and infrastructure.

Summary of comments below:

- Can you explain the proposals for land at Leaf Lane?
- Why are we proposing so many homes at Keresley, what will happen to the ancient woodlands and what infrastructure will be provided?
- How will you encourage people to cycle more, especially around the city centre?
- Can you explain the proposed development at Walsgrave Hill Farm and what highway improvements are planned.
- Can you explain how the Coventry local plan takes account of the planned Gateway development and how it would respond to possible development at Kings Hill.
- Can you explain the background to the population projections and how they are used to generate the housing requirements?
- Will the City centre AAP help improve the city centre pavements?
- Why are we only seeing new housing built for students in the city centre? Will we see non-student housing provided in the city centre.
- How does the Plan intend to manage the issue of HiMO's?
- Support for proposed blue light access at the Hospital and highway improvements at the A46 in that location.
- Support for possible de-culverting of the River Sherbourne around Palmer Lane.
- The City Centre AAP needs to do more to plan for new trees and green infrastructure in the city centre.
- How are we covering concerns over flooding? We do not want to see problems like we have in Cumbria.

Feedback from City Centre Drop-in session Saturday 6th February 2016

The enquires ranged from accessibility for cyclists throughout the city to development of Green Belt land in Eastern Green and the impact of development and Green Belt re-designation in Whitley.

Summary of comments below:

- How will we improve access to the city centre from Eastern Green for cyclists?
- How can we ensure that public transport services can go from A to B without having to go near to change in in the city centre?
- Have we considered slum clearance in Foleshill and Hillfields to make more room for new houses?

- Where will the shops be located in Eastern Green? Will they be near existing housing, similarly where will the schools be located, as it wouldn't be a nice environment to live near.
- What is the council doing about dropped kerbs and people driving over the footway?
- Accept the re-designation of Green Belt to Local Green Space and the added protection that gives.
- Development of Green Belt will remove land that people access for leisure purposes.
- Improving the city centre will add to the tourism and historic protection. Would like to see a civic hall type development.
- Accept that cities change and grow. Some reluctance but accept there is a need and that society changes and evolves.

**Local Plan and City Centre AAP public meeting converted to Drop-in session –
Monday 8th February 2016**

Lentons Lane Baptist Church, Longford

Questions and comments from the audience

Following the rearrangement of this event to President Kennedy, the attendance to this session was low and the event was converted to a drop-in style discussion instead of a presentation and question/answer session.

The main focus of discussion though was the development proposals at Keresley and the impacts this would have on the existing residential areas and the Green Belt in general. Questions were also asked about infrastructure and flood risk concerns.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP Drop-in session – Thursday 11th February 2016

President Kennedy School, Keresley

Questions and comments from attendees

The discussion focused on the perceived need for new housing and the impact that any development would have on the existing Green Belt, existing residential areas and infrastructure. As such, the discussion was broadly consistent with the issues raised at the public meeting and ward forum.

Other topics included:

- What sort of employment land is to be provided across the city?
- Is there any guarantee that employment land is actually going to happen at Browns Lane and eastern Green?
- How will developments be brought forward in a comprehensive way if the land is all in different ownerships?
- How was the housing need requirements calculated?
- Where are these people coming from?
- What percentages of new homes will be affordable?
- What impact will the Combined Authority proposals have on the Local Plan?
- Why do we need to build so many new homes?
- Where are these new homes going to be built?
- Where will Warwickshire be providing the homes that Coventry cannot accommodate?
- Where are people going to work?
- Why isn't Warwick University providing more student accommodation on its campus?
- Specific objections to Green Belt development in principle - Instead of building on the Green Belt we should build more high-rise tower blocks in the city centre – The Barbican in London is a great example.
- What will happen to the hospitals capacity and its ability to treat patients?
- How will the capacity of gas, electric, water, sewage all be managed?
- Specific objection to the Keresley proposals for initial 800 homes and the wider proposals for 3,100.
- How the Bennetts Road South is going to cope, this road can't take any more traffic
- This Council Do Not Listen to People – recent examples at Broad Lane/A45 junction is a prime example
- Why don't you develop small pockets of land all over the Green Belt land rather building on a few larger sites
- Don't want to see any new roads built or the city grow at all.
- New roads and homes will mean more traffic, pollution and congestion
- If new homes are built can we make sure some are bungalows and homes for older people?

Local Plan and City Centre AAP Drop-in session – Monday 15th February 2016

St Andrews Church, Eastern Green

Questions and comments from attendees

The discussion focused on the perceived need for new housing and the impact that any development would have on the existing Green Belt (including the Meriden Gap), existing residential areas and infrastructure. As such, the discussion was broadly consistent with the issues raised at the public meeting and ward forum.

Other topics included:

- Traffic impact on existing road networks and accessibility into the City Centre, especially along Allesley Old Road and Holyhead Road.
- The need for quality affordable housing to help meet local needs and the impact of property prices on the local community. This especially linked to the ability of local young people to stay in the local area.
- Concerns were raised about possible large scale warehousing on the site and the damage this could cause to the wider landscape.
- Residents seemed more supportive of smaller scale employment provisions that would be less intrusive and visually significant.
- If retail units are provided there was a preference for a high end food retailer rather than a lower value alternative.
- There were questions about where all the people were coming from and how the city's population was going to grow to such an extent.
- This included discussions around the impacts of immigration.
- The need for new jobs was discussed and supported in principle.
- The benefits that new homes could generate for the City Council in terms of Council Tax receipts was recognised and supported in principle.
- Notwithstanding, there were concerns that the Local Plan proposals were "driven by money".
- Numerous concerns were raised that people living in these new homes will just go to Solihull for shopping and won't use Coventry City Centre. A number of residents suggested this is already an established pattern.
- Concerns were raised that the increase in student numbers is bringing down the quality of shops.
- Some residents suggested they were not aware of the consultation and that it should be extended beyond the current 6 week period.
- Further concerns were expressed that the Plans were being rushed through without the say of local people
- People expressed objections to any growth that would see the city merge with Birmingham
- One comment suggested the City Council was wasting money on redevelopment schemes in the city centre.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP Drop-in session – Tuesday 16th February 2016

Whitley Academy, Whitley

Questions and comments from attendees

The discussion focused on the perceived need for new housing and employment land and the impact that any development would have on the existing Green Belt (especially around the existing Whitley Business Park). Concerns were raised around the impact development would have on existing residential areas, infrastructure and local wildlife and ecology. As such, the discussion was broadly consistent with the issues raised at the public meeting and ward forum.

Other topics included:

- Proposed employment allocation east of Whitley business park is too extensive and doesn't respect the presence of ecological and biodiversity habitats.
- Proposed employment allocation would create significant highways impacts for the Stonehouse residents in terms of vehicular movements through the estate.
- Proposed employment allocation is too close to the Sowe Valley flood plain and will render any proposal to develop in this area, a risk.
- Immigrants are a significant issue and pushing the city's housing need to unsustainable levels.
- Any development at Whitley needs to respect the Sowe Valley and associated ecological assets.
- If JLR pull out at Whitley like they did at Browns Lane, residents will be left with a huge factory in their area which would blight their lives and negatively affect their house prices.
- Coventry needs to work with its neighbouring authorities to ensure any cross boundary housing issues are properly planned.
- The loss of green infrastructure in the area is unacceptable
- Opportunities to improve access to the Sowe Valley footpath should be promoted.
- Concerns that vehicular access to the site would be through the Stonebridge Estate which officers suggested would be extremely unlikely.
- Does the Local Plan make alternative sites available for playing fields such as the Henrys sport pitches which could be lost?
- Suggestions that the land at Baginton Fields should be designated as Local Green Space and not allocated for development.
- Support for the construction of larger more aspirational housing.
- Support for the principle of new development being used to improve access to the LNR and enhance its quality.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP Drop-in session – Wednesday 17th February 2016

Xcel Leisure Centre, Canley

Questions and comments from attendees

The main themes related to traffic congestion and the impact on the local road network. Comments ranged from issues with Tile Hill railway station and associated traffic impact to congestion at the Local Centre at Station Avenue. As such, the discussion was broadly consistent with the issues raised at the 2 public meetings.

Other comments included:

- Need to ensure all the homes are privately owned, don't want affordable homes or a mass of rental properties for students.
- Don't want flats or terrace housing – we need to see more family homes.
- Access to the site needs to be carefully considered and should not be directly opposite Charter Avenue.
- Impact on the Green Belt – don't believe the land in the area should be taken out of the Green Belt.
- Impact on the Meriden Gap – building on the point above there was concern that the land at Cromwell Lane would reduce the Meriden gap in that location.
- Flooding issues will be exacerbated by development at Cromwell Lane and anything at Duggins Lane.
- Need to consider wildlife habitat impacts caused by development.
- Welcomed additional development to improve housing stock.
- Lack of locally accessible services without use of motor vehicle – this should be improved through the Local Plan.
- Concerns about the impacts of new development proposals on existing homes, business and residents.
- Owner of land at Westwood Heath (south of Westwood Heath Road) wants to build a single house and cannot because site is in the Green Belt. Would support proposals to remove the land from the Green Belt around draft Policy GB2.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP Drop-in session – Wednesday 24th February 2016

Grangehurst Primary School, Longford

Questions and comments from attendees

Attendance to this session was low and discussion relating to either Plan was limited. There was some discussion however around local infrastructure, most notably local bus services and if these could be improved as part of new development.

Local Plan and City Centre AAP Drop-in session – Wednesday 24th February 2016

Grangehurst Primary School, Longford

Questions and comments from attendees

The main themes related to highway and parking issues in the local area. There were also issues raised around city centre accessibility, bus services and city centre car parking. As such, the discussion was broadly consistent with the issues raised at the public meeting.

Other comments included:

- City Centre is in need of investment and regeneration
- The current city centre offer is poor and it needs more shops and to be less student orientated.
- City centre car parking is too expensive and poor quality, especially when compared to Arena Park.
- Access to local services including health care and public transport needs to be improved.
- There are concerns about parking issues along Grange Road and how these will be impacted by new development.
- The amount of homes to be built at Sutton Stop and Grange Farm will have major impacts on the local road network. I can't see how the Local Plan can respond to these
- There are hardly any bus services around Sutton Stop – how can you expect to promote public transport if the busses won't serve the area.

Appendix 6 – Full Responses to the Draft Local Plan – Publication Draft (2016)

The following appendix contains a copy of all responses received to the Local Plan consultation. All responses are replicated in full.

All responses are available alongside the other Scrutiny Board reports and Appendices but due to their size are contained in a separate file under the following link: <http://www.coventry.gov.uk/localplan/>

Appendix 7 – Full Responses to the Draft City Centre Area Action Plan – Publication Draft (2016)

The following appendix contains a copy of all responses received to the City Centre Area Action Plan consultation. All responses are replicated in full.

All responses are available alongside the other Scrutiny Board reports and Appendices but due to their size are contained in a separate file under the following link: <http://www.coventry.gov.uk/localplan/>

Appendix 8 – Proposed Minor Amendments to the Local Plan and City Centre Area Action Plan

The following tables include a list and explanation of proposed adjustments to the Local Plan and City Centre Area Action Plan. The changes are proposed as a result of consultation exercises and are aimed at improving clarity and certainty of the Plans.

All changes are subject to the approval of the appointed Planning Inspector.

Amended versions of both Plans will be provided at the submission stage which includes tracked changes to help clarify these to the Inspector. These will be provided purely as informative items though and will remain subject to public examination and the Inspectors on-going considerations.

Table 1 – Local Plan Minor Changes

Page number/Policy reference	Proposed amendment	Justification and reasoning
Page 19 2nd set of bullet points	Add Highways England after the reference to the Integrated Transport Authority.	Correct previous oversight and respond to consultation
Page 32 penultimate Para	Ansty figure should total 29ha instead of 20	correcting a miscalculation of available land at Ansty
Page 34 Para above table	reference to 216ha should equal 225ha	correcting a miscalculation of available land at Ansty
Page 34 Table 3.1	Ryton and Ansty row should total 56ha (instead of 47ha) whilst total should be 225ha instead of 216ha	correcting a miscalculation of available land at Ansty
Table 4.1 - Page 46	update windfall allowance from 32 per annum to 36 per annum - change supply table and capacity references accordingly	To amend typographical and calculation error
Table 4.2 in Policy H2 - Page s48-50	Keresley - add reference to Jubilee Woodland being protected	to aid clarity and support sustainable development principles. All issues would be picked up through wider plan
	Eastern Green - include reference to screening to existing residential areas and strengthen Pickford Green reference to say buffering and screening to protect the transition of land use into the wider Green Belt	

	Walsgrave Hill Farm - add reference to facilitating and working with on-going highway proposals by Highways England linked to new Grade Separated junction at Clifford Bridge	policies. These references simply enhance their clarity and importance.
	Walsgrave Hill Farm - add reference to essential drainage and flood risk infrastructure	
	Whitmore Park - add "as appropriate." to end of sentence	
	Browns Lane - add reference to protection of trees and hedgerows and need to focus primary access link to Coundon Wedge Drive	
	Land at Sutton stop - (add permission reference) also add "Development will need to ensure that highways access and provisions are adequate and suitable for the site. This could include a remodelling of the junction of Sutton Stop and Grange Road and at Alderman's Green Road	
	Grange Farm - highway improvements to Grange Road	
	Cromwell Lane - add reference to "Westwood Farm and other listed buildings within and adjacent to the site"	
page 68 - last Para row 9	add in brackets after HiMO's to say (small and large)	to aid clarity
page 74 - 2nd paragraph	amend reference to JE8 to say JE6	to ensure correct reference
Page 96 - GB2	amend point 2 by adding the following words after the end of the 2nd sentence: "Where land is related to the provision and potential expansion of existing schools however, this should be retained for such use"	To ensure the policy continues to make adequate infrastructure provision and improve clarity of the policy
Page 104 - GE3 point 3	add reference to newly planted woodlands as well as ancient woodlands	response to consultation
Page 105 - GE4 supporting text - first Para after policy	remove the word "minimum"	response to consultation
HE3 - pages 114-115	Amend wording around policy HE3 and supporting text. Include reference to new masterplan being developed with local community and opportunities to designate new Local Green Space east of the River Sherbourne to reflect new boundaries created through the masterplan process and movement of school facilities to new site. Wording expanded to clarify the movement of playing courts and pitches as well as car park.	to reflect consultation and on-going work through the masterplan with all relevant partners

Chapter 10 - accessibility - pages 116 -136	Small adjustments to wording to strengthen references to public transport infrastructure. Updated diagrams to be included in chapter to show highway schemes more clearly, especially around the existing road network and urban areas.	aid clarity and respond to consultation
Page 146 - 1st Paragraph below policy	Delete wording "Error! Bookmark not defined" as reference included in error	remove typing error
chapter 11 - Environmental Management - All policies and supporting text pages 137 - 152	There are expected to be a small number of adjustments to these policies and their supporting text in order to respond to comments raised by the Environment Agency. We expect these to be subject to a separate Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency.	to ensure consistency with national guidance and the most appropriate and sustainable approach to flood risk is maintained and promoted.
Appendix 1	Housing Trajectory to be updated to reflect small site windfall figure (see above)	reflect change to Table 4.1
Appendix 3	Reference added to woodlands being those over 2acres in size.	aid clarity
Appendix 4	Improve quality of existing Map to reflect small adjustments to policy and supporting text wording and evolving Masterplan	respond to consultation and evolving engagement and master planning work
Appendix 7	IDP updated to reflect on-going work on costs and clarity over needs. New schemes added to reflect and clarify infrastructure requirements for new developments. This will include reference to the new bridge across the A45 to connect to Whitley South proposals. In addition the Flood Alleviation Schemes at Broad Lane/Banner Lane, Canley Brook and Upper Brookstray to committed programme in partnership with the Environment Agency.	aid clarity and respond to consultation
Appendix 8	Monitoring indicator for H11 - amend to comment on HiMO conversions (both small and large) and HiMO concentrations	removes duplication with H10
Appendix 9	front page replace reference to 8 with 9	amend typographical error
Policies Map	add possible new rail station at Stoneleigh Road - policy Ac6 linked to H2	reflect policy
Policies Map	Amend LWS land designations to only show confirmed LWS sites	aid clarity and respond to consultation
Policies Map	Amend residential allocations at Keresley and Cromwell Lane to remove existing homes from the allocated boundary	aid clarity and respond to consultation

Policies Map	Heat line route to be added to the map	aid clarity and respond to consultation
Policies Map	Remove Local Green Space designation at Energy From Waste Plant expansion - currently overlaps	aid clarity and respond to consultation
Policies Map	Adjust Local Green Space designations and boundaries at the following locations. Built area of Ernseford Grange, Caludon Castle and Alderman's Green Primary School, Retail store (built area only) at Ansty Road, Properties on Cherrybrook Way, Lucerne Close and Almond Tree Avenue, Land at Alard Way (the main highway strip) and built land at Alan Higgs Centre and Land south of Eburne Road to reflect extant planning permission as part of NDC Masterplan	aid clarity, respond to consultation and ensure Local Green Space designations are robustly drawn.
Local Plan as a whole	Remove any references to Local urban Green Space and replace with Local Green Space	to reflect appropriate name of designation

Table 2 – City Centre Area Action Plan Minor Changes

Page number/Policy reference	Proposed amendment	Justification and reasoning
Natural Environment Section	There are expected to be a small number of adjustments to these policies and their supporting text in order to respond to comments raised by the Environment Agency. We expect these to be subject to a separate Statement of Common Ground with the Environment Agency.	To ensure consistency with national guidance and the most appropriate and sustainable approach to flood risk is maintained and promoted.

NB: All changes will be incorporated into a Tracked Changes version of the Local Plan and Area Action Plan to accompany the submission to the Secretary of State.