

FC Rep	Consultee	Consultation response summary
1	Chris Wightman Coventry and Warwickshire Local Enterprise Partnership	The Coton Neighbourhood Plan provides an appropriate vision for the future and sets out a series of objectives and policies that reflect a balanced and orderly plan for the future of the area. The Neighbourhood Plan provides an appropriate response to facilitate enhanced residential amenity and access to retail and employment facilities.
2	Rachel Bust Coal Authority	Coton Forward area is outside of the defined coalfield and therefore The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan.
3	Pete Boland English Heritage	<p>On the basis of the information supplied, including the copy of the Draft Neighbourhood Plan, English Heritage concludes that there is minimal impact on the historic environment.</p> <p>Therefore, whilst the community's efforts in compiling the Draft Neighbourhood Plan are highly commendable English Heritage does not wish to make substantive comments on this occasion.</p>
4	Highways Agency	<p>Reviewed the draft Plan and feel that the objectives and supporting policies contained therein are an appropriate approach to ensuring the future management of the neighbourhood.</p> <p>In view of this the Highways Agency is content with the draft Plan in so far as it might affect the operation of the SRN. Therefore we would support the policies contained within the plan without further comment.</p>
5	John Harris	<p>Plan has not been written by the Neighbourhood Forum but by a select few individuals and not signed off by all the members of the forum.</p> <p>Questions make up of the forum and the level of engagement in both forum meetings and community consultations.</p> <p>Questions a number of comments within the Plan which are not subjective and not backed up by evidence.</p> <p>Highlights that only 51 respondents out of 3,000 residents supported the community centre therefore it cannot be claimed that it has a huge support from the local community. Also highlights that the business case for the community centre was not seen by the forum and therefore questions the role of the forum membership.</p>

		<p>Highlights that his own questions raised to the forum were not answered.</p> <p>Coton Forward (CF) is run by a very few unelected, unrepresentative, undemocratic, non-accountable individuals who are also running Coton Park Residents Association. This in itself is not a problem but the rigour needed to run a Neighbourhood Plan is far greater than needed to run a Residents Association.</p> <p>CF has had a very poor response from residents (66 responses only from 900 houses and 3000 residents) that consideration must be given to whether CF can continue. We may be faced with a situation where a Neighbourhood Plan (NP) is voted on at a referendum and maybe 34 votes are cast (51% of 66 people so far interested) and the Plan is carried. That would not be democratic. It may be viewed as disappointing but the vast majority of the residents in the NP area are just not interested or engaged with the NP or CF.</p>
6	Chris White	<p>Believes that the plan is retrospective as opposed to forward planning.</p> <p>Highlights that of the initial questionnaire to highlight three priorities for the plan roundabout design was not mentioned and only 3 responses were with regard to roundabouts at the Pre Submission stage.</p> <p>Proposal is based on a flawed Transport Report based on a bias project brief.</p> <p>The use of questionable data, erroneous and contradictory statements.</p> <p>This is an expensive solution to problems that do not exist. There are easier, cheaper proposals for some minor improvements. Highlights that at the consultation stage resident identified two alternative routes for stagecoach which would be cheaper.</p> <p>Proposal involves replacing one traffic calming measures (roundabout) with another (raised table).</p>

		<p>A “green” communal space contradicts the original design concept of Georgian street scene.</p> <p>Removing roundabouts are unjustifiable costs, no obvious benefits but will increase traffic speed. No cost/benefits analysis done</p> <p>Suggests alterations to the plan and discussions with businesses to alleviate issues on the estate.</p> <p>Policy 2 requires more detail for anybody to make a decision on</p> <p>Creation of communal parking facilities - David Tucker Report quotes the Highway Code about parking on pavements but the proposed solution is for parking bays with white lines on pavements. Proposals would be against the design of the estate. Parking is provided at the back of properties but some people do not use it. Provision of parking bays will legitimise pavement parking rewarding the inconsiderate. Painting of white lines on the pavement will contravene the original planning permission. Notes that the Plan states that on road parking will make it difficult for bus access but in the consultation statement it is stated that the Stagecoach bus trial run was driven through major roads on the estate and although parked cars were inconvenient , they did not prevent the bus from gaining access through the estate.</p> <p>Highlights that the proposal for Stonechat road was not one of the most affected roads. The works proposed for the bay would result in the removal of trees and leave inadequate pavement space as advocated by David Tucker Report. Suggests that Designated parking bays should be scraped, “soft” pressures should be applied by the Safer Neighbourhood Group and a code for living in coton park is suggested.</p> <p>Project 3 Road Marking - Drivers should be aware of the highway code and roads should not be covered in lines and signs. Coton Park Residents Association should put pressure on responsible organisations to maintain the markings at roundabout approaches.</p> <p>Policy 4 and Project 2 are supported</p>
--	--	---

7	Maureen White	<p>No comments provided however forms filled in stating objections or support to policies and projects.</p> <p>Policies 1,2,3 and projects 1,3,4,5 objected Policy 4 and project 2 supported.</p>
8	Hanna Staton Pegasus Planning on behalf of Persimmon Homes	<p>Uncertainty as to how land use policies will be delivered given the limitations of the legal framework.</p> <p>Policy 1 – concerns that the removal of the roundabout at Coton Park Drive and Stonechat Road with a junction will reduce capacity and lead to queues and delays. Alternative solution would be reduce vegetation which will improve visibility. This would reduce potentially conflict and improve safety.</p> <p>No objections with regard to Policies 2 and 3.</p> <p>Policy 4 designates local green spaces which are already identified as green spaces within the Core Strategy. In light of this, is it necessary to add an extra layer of policy protecting the sites?</p> <p>Highlight that there are longer term aspirations to develop north east of Coton Park which could facilitate a second access therefore project relating to secondary access for the estate is supported.</p> <p>Supports traffic management measures initiatives</p>
9	Warwickshire County Council	<p>Pleased that a car share database scheme has been considered and we would have no objection to this particular project.</p> <p>Raised concerns on the following Roundabouts</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- removing the roundabout on Coton Park Drive/Stonechat Roundabout and reducing</li> </ul>

		<p>the diameters of both Stonechat Road/Crackthorne Drive and Longstork Road/Tuthill Furlong could allow speeds to increase.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Introducing a central feature on the two smaller roundabouts could increase risk to drivers negotiating the roundabout due to reduced visibility.</li> <li>- The feasibility and costs of relocating the various utilities and services beneath the roundabouts would need to be considered to ascertain whether the proposals are deliverable.</li> <li>- The roundabout on Longstork Road/Tuthill Furlong has not been adopted by the County Council and is therefore under the ownership of the developer. The developer should be contacted regarding any concerns, alterations or additions concerning the roundabout.</li> </ul> <p><b>Parking Spaces</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- No drawings were submitted or included with the proposal which specify where the parking spaces would be located.</li> </ul> <p><b>2-way Access Road</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The 2-way access road located on the eastern end of estate is under ownership of the developer and any concerns, alterations or additions should be made to them.</li> </ul> <p><b>Road Markings</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- There were no drawings or specifications included with the proposal regarding the road markings and we therefore cannot provide comments at this stage.</li> </ul> <p><b>Impact on resources</b></p> <p>Neighbourhood plans have the same statutory weight as the Local Plan and the Infrastructure should identify where the funding will come from. The Infrastructure Development Plan should not be reliant on resources from the County Council.</p>
10	Jill Simpson-Vince	Asks the examiner to consider extending the referendum area to include Betony Road and all the smaller roads off it as the transport routes will directly affect them.

11	John Dingley, Environment Agency	No Objections. Plan largely falls outside their remit.
12	C. Thomas	<p>Project 2 (page 23): There needs to be another access road onto the estate. In particular Langlands Place is the only access into and out of the latest extension to the David Wilson development.</p> <p>Project 3 (page 24): Parking and the speed of vehicles is of concern. The layout of the roads does not support safe driving of vehicles at 30mph and I am sure the original design was considered in order to slow vehicles. Unfortunately, a number of drivers drive too quickly which along with parking on bends and approaches to roundabouts makes for an unsafe environment for both drivers and pedestrians, in particular children. I believe a 20 mph speed limit would be more appropriate along with road markings at junctions and roundabouts prohibiting parking.</p> <p>The pylons are unsightly, can the cables be buried?</p>
13	Steve Parkes	<p>Estate is built to varying density standards and is not constructed to a very high density</p> <p>P11. 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph not strictly correct should be “all these planned and proposed schemes need to be accessed via Coton Park Drive from the roundabout on the A426 to the west or from Newton Manor Lane to the South”</p> <p>P11 reference to “a modern retail area “ more appropriately be referred to as a local centre</p> <p>P16. Dentist could be accommodated at the local centre should a suitable unit become available</p> <p>P17 and p18 Roundabouts have been designed in such a manner to reduce speed with overruns to accommodate buses. Reducing diameter of roundabouts would increase speeds and have highway safety consequences. With regard to Coton Park and Stonechat Road this has been problematic acknowledges that signage and gateway entrance can potentially help alleviate HGV issues. With regards to the new open space to be provided as a result of alterations who will maintain it? To fit in with the design of the site the new space should be a feature square with planted trees to stop parking.</p> <p>P18 Coton Park is a planned development based on a master plan and residential design guides. The site took account of the most up to date urban design guidance. More recent</p>

		<p>developments outside the neighbourhood plan area have been through the plan application process as opposed to the plan making.</p> <p>Page 19 Policy 2 – gateway features good idea providing its proportionate</p> <p>P20 and 21 All open space bar one are formally adopted and maintained by the Council through a S106 agreement only development allowed would be those ancillary to such use. Therefore the open spaces are already afforded protection.</p> <p>Project 5 – idea of community garden a good idea as long as it is open to all sections of the community in accordance with S106 agreement. Allotments are more problematic as they will take away open space and will only benefit certain individuals which would conflict with S106 agreement ( unless modified)</p> <p>Implementation – there is nothing within the document stating who is going to take on, carry out and pay for the suggested improvements. There is no recognition that the highways, including feature areas where additional parking is proposed, are under the control of and responsibility of the highways authority.</p>
--	--	---