

### **Addendum to Scrutiny Board 3 Report**

The following paper is an addendum to the report published for The Business, Economy and Enterprise Scrutiny Board 3 ahead of its meeting on 16<sup>th</sup> March 2016. The report has been produced with the permission of the chair and allows for a small number of updates to the original report. This reflects the continued work officers have been undertaking in relation to responses received to the Local Plan and City Centre Area Action Plan.

#### **Main report**

##### **1. Para 7.2 is to be amended as follows:**

The Survey Monkey questionnaire contained 4 questions. These focused on the general views of both Plans as well as direct questions about the level of information available and views on the overarching objective of being a Top 10 City again. A total of 697 people completed the Survey Monkey process, although not everyone answered every question. Indeed, due to the inappropriate nature of some responses a number were deleted by officers. This effected 16 in relation to the Local Plan and 91 responses to the AAP. Of the responses received to the Plans 483 related to the Local Plan and 285 to the City Centre AAP. The Table below highlights the number of responses received to each question.

<b>Question</b>	<b>Answered</b>	<b>Skipped</b>	<b>Support</b>	<b>Object</b>	<b>Not Sure</b>
Do you think Coventry should grow so it can be a top ten city?	692	5	204	379	109
What do you think of the Local Plan?*	483	198	60	413	10
What do you think of the City Centre Area Action Plan?***	285	321	133	108	44
Do you think you have you had enough information and opportunities to tell us what you think about the Local Plan and the City Centre Area Action Plan?	504	193	83	353	68

\* In relation to the question about the Local Plan please note that 2 responses on the Survey Monkey were discounted as they duplicated responses received via email and/or in writing. A further 14 responses were deleted as they contained disparaging remarks and/or inappropriate language.

\*\* In relation to the question about the City Centre AAP please note that 1 response to the Survey Monkey was discounted as it duplicated a response received via email and/or in writing. A further 90 responses were deleted as they either responded to the Local Plan and not the AAP or contained disparaging remarks and/or inappropriate language.

**2. Para 7.3 should then be read as follows:**

Based on officer's review of the responses to Survey Monkey questionnaire, it would appear that the vast majority of responses are from local residents. There would appear to be very few examples of duplications and where it has been possible to remove them they have been deleted. A total of 2 responses were identified within the Survey monkey questionnaires which were not from local residents. These were submitted by McCarthy and Stone and Elite Student Accommodation Services. Both in relation to the local Plan and both broadly supportive.

**3. Para 7.7 should now read:**

With regards the City Centre AAP, a further 15 responses were received, with 12 being from organisations and companies whilst the other 3 were from local residents. As such a total of 288 responses were received to the AAP from local residents. These issues again mirrored the discussions had at the public meetings and drop-in sessions and focused on the following points:

**4. First Sentence at Para 8.1: Should read**

"A total of 93 responses were received to the Local Plan from other companies....., with 66 responses from the development industry....."

**5. Para 8.2 – bullet point 2:**

A number of additional sites should be referenced in this list. These include:

- Land at Allesley Village – housing / Extra Care facility
- Land at Pickford House, Pickford Green Lane - housing

**6. Insert new Para 10.3**

In addition to the proposed changes at appendix 8 and attached to this addendum, a number of additional documents will be added into the Council's evidence base. These include:

1. The Flood Risk Assessment and its Addendum relating to the Siskin Drive site. These were undertaken in support of the most recent Planning Permission granted in 2014 (FUL/2014/0659).
2. The Indicative Masterplan which supports the scheme at Sutton Stop that was granted permission in 2014 (the land including the marina and creation of the country park) (FUL/2013/0727).
3. A copy of the indicative masterplan for Paragon Park which supports the planning permission granted in 2015 (OUT/2014/2538)

4. An Addendum to the SHLAA (2016) to include site appraisals of the sites submitted to this stage of the Local Plan consultation.

Update to Appendix 8

Page number/Policy reference	Proposed amendment	Justification and reasoning
Page 10 – Objective 1 – add new sub-objective	“Build on the universities as an engine for research, innovation and culture in the city”	Respond to consultation comments
Page 10 – Objective 4 – add new sub-objective	“Support the city’s 2 world class universities as they continue to strengthen their national and global reputation”	Respond to consultation comments
Page 27 – new paragraph into supporting text after final Para	“In particular JLR has established itself as a global business and is the UK’s largest automotive employer, creating both direct and indirect jobs across the city, sub-region and the UK as a whole. JLR’s existing site at Whitley Business Park is home to its global headquarters and is an advance engineer’s facility, as well as the Jaguar Design department. The site currently employs in excess of 5,200 people with this figure expected to grow substantially in the coming years as JLR continues to push forward with its own expansion plans. The City Council is committed to working jointly with JLR and Warwick District Council in particular to help support the planned growth of JLR in the most appropriate way. This includes the City Council’s commitment to supporting the Whitley South proposals in Warwick District but also the allocation of land adjacent to Whitley Business Park at Baginton Fields. This site will help to create an employment hub for the south east corner of Coventry which could help support the longer term expansion of JLR at Whitley, support the sustainable growth of its supply chain or provide a stand-alone inward investment opportunity.”	Respond to consultation comments
Page 29 - Policy JE1 part e	Amendment to text to strengthen reference to JLR and its importance to the local manufacturing economy – “Support companies, including Jaguar Land Rover, in retaining, expanding and/or relocating their headquarters operations within the city and support the provision of new infrastructure that encourages these companies to grow”.	Respond to consultation comments
Page 29 – new point (i) added to Policy JE1	“Support the continued growth of the city’s 2 universities and in doing so maximise the economic development and other community benefits associated with them”	Respond to consultation comments

Table 4.2 in Policy H2 - Page s48-50	Keresley, Sutton Stop and Cromwell Lane - add reference to screening to existing residential areas	To aid clarity and support sustainable development principles.
Page 61 – final Para below Policy H7	Replace “likens” with “draws some similarities between” and then replace “to” with “and” to ensure sentence reads correctly. Sentence will then read - “By way of reasonable travelling distance, national guidance draws some similarities between sites for Gypsy and Travellers and sites for general bricks and mortar housing.”	To aid clarity, respond to consultation comment and strengthen conformity with national guidance.
Page 75 – policy R2	Adjust Part m of the policy so it reads “continuing to support greater integration of the university within the wider city centre in accordance with the policies in the Area Action Plan”.  Add a new part ‘o’ which says: “Supporting the reintroduction of blue infrastructure throughout the city centre, including opportunities for deculverting wherever possible”	Respond to consultation comments
Pages 93-96 – Policy GB1 and supporting text	Part 2 of this policy is to be split into parts A and B. Part 2A will reflect the existing content of Part 2 of the policy. Part 2B will read as follows:  “Within areas designated as Local Green Space the erection of small buildings and structures which are ancillary to the primary use of the land may be acceptable. Other development will not be permitted unless very special circumstances are demonstrated”.  A new paragraph is then to be added to the supporting text on page 96 at the end of the existing section on Local Green Space which reads as follows:  “National Guidance requires development proposals within areas designated as Local Green Space to be considered against local policies which are consistent with policy for Green Belts. This principle is broadly accepted through Policy GB1, however it is important to consider the context of Green Belt policy against that of Local Green Spaces. Any development within Local Green Spaces should for example not impact	To aid clarity, respond to consultation comments and ensure conformity with National Guidance.

	<p>on the initial purpose of land being considered as a locally important green space or impact negatively on criteria set out in Para 77 of the NPPF. Of particular importance is land used for recreational and leisure use, especially sports pitches. It is acknowledged that some developments may be required to support the continued use of sites as high quality sports pitches (e.g. buildings for changing facilities and related teaching or training provisions) and this would be supported in principle. Other acceptable examples will include the provision of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• new play equipment within parks and public spaces;</li> <li>• appropriate and suitable parking facilities at parks and public spaces;</li> <li>• appropriate lighting (in terms of scale and surrounding uses) to support sports facilities; and</li> <li>• the provision of appropriate and suitable footpaths and cycle ways to enhance accessibility to high quality green spaces.</li> </ul> <p>In all cases development should be ancillary to the primary purpose of the Local Green Space. Should development prevent the continued use of land for sports pitches, or other forms of Local Green Space (as appropriate) however, this will not be supported.”</p>	
Page 96 – last Para of local green space supporting text	Add new sentence “This approach will also be taken forward in relation to the land around Charterhouse Heritage Park (policy He3) and the employment allocations at Whitley Business Park and Baginton Fields (JE2)”.	To aid clarity, respond to consultation comments and strengthen the protection around these areas.
Page 98 – Policy GE1 Point 5	Replace last sentence of this part of the policy with the following text: “Where a development proposal lies adjacent to a river corridor or tributary, a natural sinuous river channel should be retained or, where possible reinstated. Culverts should be removed unless it can be demonstrated that it is impractical to do so.”	To aid clarity and respond to consultation comments.
Page 98 – Policy GE1 Point 6	Add the following points to the end of Part 6 of this policy:	To aid clarity and respond to consultation comments.

	<p>d) Improving its functionality, quality, connectivity and accessibility</p> <p>e) Ensuring that a key aim of green infrastructure is the maintenance and improvement and expansion of biodiversity;</p> <p>f) Integrating proposals to improve green infrastructure in the delivery of new developments, particularly through area based regeneration initiatives and major proposals and schemes;</p> <p>g) Flood risk management and improving surface water quality.</p>	
Page 104 Policy GE3 Part 1	<p>Add a new point d to this part of the policy to say the following:</p> <p>d) preserve species which are legally protected, in decline, are rare within Coventry or which are covered by national, regional or local Biodiversity Action Plans”</p>	To aid clarity and respond to consultation comments.
Page 138 Policy EM1 Part 1	<p>Add a new point f to this part of the policy to say the following:</p> <p>f) seek opportunities to make space for water and develop new blue infrastructure to accommodate climate change</p>	To aid clarity and respond to consultation comments.
Page 143 Policy EM5	<p>In Part 1 of the policy delete the following reference “...unless it can be clearly demonstrated there are practical reasons for not doing so...”.</p>	aid clarity and respond to consultation
Page 138 Policy EM7	<p>In part 1 of the policy add 2 new points to say the following:</p> <p>‘f) Existing waste management facilities or land allocated for waste management uses being protected from encroachment by incompatible land uses that are more sensitive to odour, noise, dust and pest impacts.</p> <p>g) Proposals for waste management facilities only being permitted where they would not have an unacceptable impact on the quantity or quality of surface or groundwater resources’.</p>	aid clarity and respond to consultation
Appendix 7	<p>Add additional reference to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The improvements to the flood alleviation bund at Siskin Drive to support allocated Gypsy and Traveller site and relate to extant planning permission.</li> <li>• The enhancement and creation of Wetlands at Lake View Park</li> </ul>	To reflect condition of approved policy and reflect panned Warwickshire Wildlife Trust proposals.

**Table 2 – City Centre Area Action Plan Minor Changes**

Page number/Policy reference	Proposed amendment	Justification and reasoning
Glossary Page 3	Amend the definition of SuDS to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).	To allow for technical correction
Page 7 – Policy CC1	<p>In order to reflect changes to Local Plan policy R2 –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Amend penultimate bullet point to read - “continuing to support greater integration of the university within the wider city centre in accordance with the policies in the Area Action Plan”. and</li> <li>• Add a new bullet point which says: “Supporting the reintroduction of blue infrastructure throughout the city centre, including opportunities for deculverting wherever possible”</li> </ul>	Respond to consultation comments
Page 9 – Para 5.1	Amend 2 <sup>nd</sup> bullet point to say: “The creation of good quality green and blue infrastructure;”.	To aid clarity, respond to consultation comment
Page 18 end of Para 5	“Furthermore, opportunities to deculvert or ‘day-light’ and restore the River Sherbourne and its tributaries will be supported in principle”.	Provide consistency with wider Plan references and respond to consultation
Page 18, Policy CC8	<p>Amend final sentence of Part A of this policy to read as follows:</p> <p>“Development shall support meeting the objectives of the Severn River Basin Management Plan through ensuring that no deterioration of the River Sherbourne or its tributaries shall occur that may result in it failing to meet its objectives under the</p>	To aid clarity and allow for technical correction. Also to respond to consultation comment.



	Water Framework Directive”.	
Page 20 Policy CC9	Change title of Policy to “Managing Water”	To aid clarity, respond to consultation comment
Page 20 Policy CC9 part a	Delete the word “urban” from SUDS  Add an additional sentence to the end of this part of the policy to say the following:  “Such provisions should consider opportunities to reflect the alignment of the River Sherbourne and/or its tributaries”.	To ensure technical correction, aid clarity, respond to consultation comment and retain reference to creating reflective features of the river bodies if deculverting is not possible.
Page 20 Policy CC9 – part e	Amend 2 <sup>nd</sup> sentence of policy to read as follows:  “Consideration should also be given to removing water bodies from culverts wherever possible and viable (having regard to Figure 6). This will be of particular importance along Fairfax Street and will be vital to creating multi-functional green and blue spaces within the city centre”	To aid clarity, respond to consultation comment and strengthen opportunities to deculvert where possible.
Page 22 – 2 <sup>nd</sup> Para under the heading ‘Contaminated Land’	Add “or the environment” to the end of the last sentence.	To aid clarity, respond to consultation comment
Accessibility section of the AAP	Additional minor change to reflect ITA commentary around accessibility and links to new development.	To aid clarity, respond to consultation comment

Page 20 Water Quality – 1st para	Amend the definition of SuDS to Sustainable Drainage Systems (SuDS).	To allow for technical correction
Page 20 Water Quality - 1 <sup>st</sup> Para last sentence	<p>Remove the first part of the sentence so it reads as follows “Opportunities should be taken to explore these within the city centre, not only around Fairfax Street and Palmer Lane but the entire as a whole.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Page 32 – “In the national context the risk of major scale flooding in Coventry City Centre is low” Please</li> </ul>	To allow for technical correction
Page 20 – Drainage and Flood Risk – 1 <sup>st</sup> para	Amend first sentence to read as follows: “In the national context the risk of major scale flooding in Coventry City Centre is low”	Additional clarification by adding the words city centre. This avoids giving a false impression of flood risk in the wider city area.
Page 20 – Drainage and Flood Risk – 2 <sup>nd</sup> para	Remove the last sentence of the second paragraph	To allow for factual correction
Page 23	Replace existing roman numerals with letters within the policy	To be consistent with the rest of the Plan
Page 32	Change references to “Burges” to read “The Burges” and correct part A of the policy (CC13) to relate to “Conservation Areas” instead of “Area”	To correct factual inaccuracy

Page 52 – Policy CC24 ( b)	Change reference to a “large innovatively designed” to say “High quality”	For clarification and response to consultation
Page 52 – Policy CC24 ( d)	Add extra sentence to the end of this part of the policy to read as follows: “....and surrounding public realm. Proposals shall respect the design unity of this part of the University and Enterprise area.”	For clarification and response to consultation
Page 55 policy CC25 ( c)	Remove the word practicable from Policy text	Strengthens the importance of ensuring green and blue infrastructure is well incorporated into new developments in this area