

CFSC Rep	Consultee	Support or Object	Consultation response summary
1	Highways England	-	Following previous consultation comment in support of the plan no further comments are made
2	John Harris	Object	<p>Consultee asked who considered previous representations made to the plan.</p> <p>Comments previously made to the Submission Consultation still stand which cover specific comments made within the plan, lack of consultation and the processes in producing the plan.</p>
3	Pegasus Planning on behalf of Persimmon Homes and AC Lloyd	Object	<p>Support the removal of the Submission Plan policies 1 and 2.</p> <p>Unclear how the modified plan policy 1 in relation to the Community Centre will be delivered therefore it is not clear and unambiguous as required by the Planning Practice Guidance and therefore not in accordance with the basic conditions. Also question whether the policy is required if the Council are supportive of such a proposal on the land.</p> <p>In light of national and local plan policies, modified policies 1 and 2, provides a further layer of policies which adds no further detail to those already in existence therefore it is unnecessary.</p> <p>Highlight in relation to modified policy 2 attention is drawn to the “richness of wildlife attributes” of the area under the pylons but there is no evidence to substantiate this, as</p>

			<p>surveys and previous works undertaken on land to the east of Coton Park have not highlighted this area being particularly valuable for ecology, so far as they are aware.</p> <p>Suggest that the Neighbourhood Plan should not prejudice implementation of long term aspirations as set out in the projects section and there is concern that this may arise due to the increase in protection that will be afforded to these particular areas, through the designation as Local Green Space.</p> <p>Question the deliverability of a number of projects within the plan.</p> <p>Plan should be withdrawn as it adds no further detail to existing policies and it is therefore superfluous to the Development Plan.</p>
4	Natural England	-	<p>Considers that the modifications to the Coton Neighbourhood Plan put forward by the Council will not impact on Natural England's interests in the natural environment. We therefore reiterate our previous response that the neighbourhood plan does not pose any likely significant risk to internationally or nationally designated nature conservation sites and so we do not wish to make any specific comments in this instance.</p>
5	Chris White	Object	<p>There was no support demonstrated during the Council's consultation. Criticism of various aspects of the Plan was expressed from several directions, including residents, Planning, Highways, and CF's own traffic consultants.</p> <p>The Independent Examiner recommended refusal. There are no substantial reason for policies 1 and 2 in the modified plan.</p> <p>No information has been offered on the status of a "Project", nor how or by whom it could be initiated, nor the process for implementation.</p> <p>From the minutes of the Cabinet meeting on 9th March 2015 "...Cabinet is recommended to take a view different to that expressed by the examiner..." regarding modification</p>

			powers. Council are therefore <u>not</u> taking a <i>different view as to a fact</i> but a <i>different view as to a view</i> . The fact that Council do not agree with the examiners opinion is inconsequential. Therefore Council have not demonstrated any valid reason to overturn the examiner's recommendation for refusal.
6	Martin Donnelly	Support	Support in principle the Council's proposal based on the information provided.
7	Nicholas Mallinson	Object	Object to the open space between Shortwheat Hill and Short Fishers Walk or the Copse area adjacent to Shortwheat Hill as possible locations for allotments.
8	Historic England	-	Historic England does not wish to make substantive comments either on the Examiners conclusions or on the Council's decision to take a contrary view
9	J Downham and M Willis	Object	Object to "Project 5 – Community Focus – Allotments and Community Gardens" for the following reasons; due to impact of the additional traffic this will generate in and around the immediate area; the proposed location for the allotments is in an area which has limited access for traffic with the most obvious route for traffic to use is via Shortwheat Hill, which is a small cul-de-sac with limited space for parking or turning vehicles; any change in the use of this green land will result in the loss of a valuable and rare open area enjoyed by local residents and nature; an allotment, irrespective of any guarantees regarding the design or upkeep, will be detrimental to the view and pleasure we currently enjoy from the green land; and concerned about the increase in noise and air pollution the additional traffic will cause.
10	Mark O'Connell	Object	Agrees with the examiner that the plan should not be supported and that the plan should be entirely refused and should not proceed any further. Cannot see how the changes made to the plan, primarily the move of Policies 1 & 2 to the Projects section, will materially affect the outcome. The Coton Forward representatives are a self elected organisation. They were not elected

			<p>by all residents. Whilst they may have complied with all of the appropriate rules and regulations, they have taken their positions in a non-democratic way.</p> <p>The examiner appears to be saying that most of the major policies and projects within this proposal need to be dealt with via the Council anyway or involve land outside of the neighbourhood area. For this reason, the examiner was unable to recommend a change to the plan. I agree with this decision and suggest that any issues within our neighbourhood are raised via the appropriate channels at the Council (or via an MP) rather than continuing with this plan. This would also allow for issues and their resolution to consider the wider Rugby area and also UK policies and plans, rather than just being focussed entirely on such a small area.</p>
11	Michael Wells	Object	<p>It is wholly artificial to modify the Neighbourhood Plan (“NP”) by moving Policies 1 and 2 into the Projects section of the NP given that the Examiner’s opinion is that those policies are central to the NP and constitute “the crux of the problem and one of the main motivations to prepare the NP”. If Policies 1 and 2 have failed to meet the statutory requirements as found by the Examiner (quite correctly in my opinion as they have nothing to do with development requiring planning permission) then it is not right that they are resurrected as a Project which would appear to be as important as ever to the Forum and is “still a key issue for the NP” (Council’s wording in the reasons column in the Appendix in the consultation document).</p>
12	Miqdad Ali	Object	<p>Strongly raises objection against Project 5 - Community Focus -Allotments and Community Gardens.</p> <p>This is raises my concern around the following:</p>

			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Additional traffic with nowhere to park - Vermin attracted by the allotments. - smell from waste/composting. - loss of green space and potential unsightliness.
13	Warwickshire County Council	Support	<p>As the Highways Authority we support the suggest modifications to delete policies regarding the three roundabouts. Therefore, these are aspirational projects without funding for the future. This will allow for time for discussion between the County Council, Rugby Borough Council and Coton Forward on the various elements of each project.</p> <p>Highlight reservations and concerns in relation to the modified Plan projects 1-5.</p>
14	Severn Trent	-	No further comment to make
15	Steve Parkes and Greg Vigers	-	No further comment to make
16	Terry Scott	Object	Was told that the green spaces will not be built upon. Concerned about existing constraints within Short Fishers Walk area such as parking and the impact allotments will have on resident's daily lives such as traffic, attracting vermin and the smell of rotting vegetables. Also the allotments will affect house prices in the area.

Please note the following summary consultation comments were made to the Council on its proposed decision to make modifications to Coton Forward Neighbourhood Plan to ensure its conformity with the basic conditions. The consultation period was between 27th March and 8th May 2015 and the comments received were considered by the Council only.