

ID	Name	Organisation	Client	Policy Number	Summary of Representation	Changes to make plan legally compliant or sound	RBC Response
----	------	--------------	--------	---------------	---------------------------	---	--------------

Key	
	Added 23.11.17
	Added 6.12.17
	Added from another policy

1112	Clive Davies	NA	NA	Appendix x 3	IDP vague in respect of infrastructure, no costs, whilst assuming developers will pay. No information on number of schools or GP surgeries required is given. Would appear Rugby Borough Council looking to increase number of dwellings in the plan whilst hoping for a miracle on the infrastructure front.		WCC Education and Highways, UHCW and CCG, and Highways England have all been fully engaged in development of the Local Plan and infrastructure measures as contained within IDP. None have raised objections to the plan. Detail of infrastructure to be provided to support local plan growth is contained in policies and the IDP which is a live document and has been updated at modifications LP54.116-140. Additional details will be finalised at the Planning Application stage.
1431	Nick Dauncey (Jasbir Kaur)	WCC Highways	NA	Appendix x 3	Also seeking to ensure provision is made for longer-term growth potentially in SE Rugby beyond forthcoming Local Plan period up to 2031, which was tested in Stage 1 of the STA. A poor SWLR design in South West area now could preclude that area coming forward in the fullness of time unless provision is made now to future-proof the Strategic East to West and North to South Links. The emerging Local Plan looks to provide growth to meet strategic targets and is of the view the proposed allocations are sufficient for this and do not		Updated STA and DS9 reflects work with Vectos and shows more effective infrastructure to bypass Dunchurch (Mods ref), however plan doesn't promote additional growth in SE and link road only intended to provide infrastructure for plan.

ID	Name	Organisation	Client	Policy Number	Summary of Representation	Changes to make plan legally compliant or sound	RBC Response
					consider for allocation is required. As such the plan should only contain mitigation to support this growth and not growth that may occur in the future.		
1431	Nick Dauncey (Jasbir Kaur)	WCC Highways	NA	Appendix x 3	<p>Phasing comments:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. It is not until the full SWLR is delivered that traffic relief benefits at Dunchurch Crossroads are experienced.</li> <li>2. The Strategic East to West Link between the A426 Rugby Road and M45/A45 is required at the earliest possible opportunity to mitigate traffic impacts in Dunchurch and the Transport Planning policies should reflect this.</li> <li>3. It would be beneficial if the initial phases of development could come forward as follows:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(a) In the area served by the A426-B4642 link - Residential Link (north to south via Cawston Lane).</li> <li>(b) In the area facing the B4642/A4071 to the north of the site, subject to early provision of the direct north to south link onto A4071 Potsford Dam.</li> </ol> </li> </ol>		Comments noted. However the updated STA which WCC commissioned is considered to supersede these comments and mods references LP54.46 - LP54.58 and LP54.120 - LP54.124 reflect this. No further action required.

ID	Name	Organisation	Client	Policy Number	Summary of Representation	Changes to make plan legally compliant or sound	RBC Response
1441	Lisa Maric	Highway England	NA	Appendix x 3	<p>Aware that WCC are currently updating their Rugby Wide Area traffic model (calibrated using 2016 data) and would like to see the Local Plan tested within this model to provide further assurances and detail on the schemes contained within the IDP. Would welcome a more detailed assessment to better define the impacts on the SRN and the infrastructure requirements for the strategic sites. Publication draft impacts:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>· M6 Junction 1 - impacts from approximately 2,200 dwellings at Rugby Gateway, Coton Park East and Coton House.</li> <li>· M45 / A45 - impacts from approximately 5,000 dwellings and 35ha of employment land to the north of the corridor, and 1,500 dwellings to the south (Lodge Farm). Number of uncertainties surrounding the funding and delivery of mitigation eg M6 J1 and M45/A45. Would welcome HE identified as a delivery partners for these schemes. Travel Plans should be produced for large residential developments which have a material impact on the SRN as per national guidance. These should be first line of mitigation.</li> </ul>	<p>Travel Plans should be produced for large residential developments which have a material impact on the SRN as per national guidance. These should be first line of mitigation.</p>	<p>The STA June 2017 updated the September 2016 STA by increasing the modelled area so that it extends south to the of the A45 and into Daventry DC, it has incorporated updated travel to work assumption, junction counts and queue surveys, to identify the strategic transport infrastructure to support the Local Plan. Policy D1 requires Travel Plans where necessary.</p>

ID	Name	Organisation	Client	Policy Number	Summary of Representation	Changes to make plan legally compliant or sound	RBC Response
2154	Robert Green			Appendix x 3	IDP vague in respect of infrastructure, no costs, whilst assuming developers will pay. No information on number of schools or GP surgeries required is given. Would appear Rugby Borough Council looking to increase number of dwellings in the plan whilst hoping for a miracle on the infrastructure front.		WCC Education and Highways, UHCW and CCG, and Highways England have all been fully engaged in development of the Local Plan and infrastructure measures as contained within IDP. None have raised objections to the plan. Detail of infrastructure to be provided to support local plan growth is contained in policies and the IDP which is a live document and has been updated at modifications LP54.116-140. Additional details will be finalised at the Planning Application stage.
1314	Sue Green	Home Builders Federation	NA	Appendix x 5	The Council should confirm that maximum car parking standards for residential developments are not been imposed	-	Residential parking standards are not stated as a maximum and accompanying notes advise they are guidance figures. Comments noted however no further action considered necessary
1378	Richard Allanch	NA	NA	Appendix x 5	Rugby Borough Council did not publish their proposed parking standards with their Preferred Options draft so this is the first time members of the public have the opportunity to comment on parking standards. For 16+ Colleges the Publication Draft proposes that with regard to parking for students and parents each case should be considered on its merits. Schools with sixth forms experience parking issues with regard to sixth formers – see Longrood Road and Duncan Drive for example. Therefore I believe the policy relating to 16+ Colleges		The parking standards are not intended to specify all forms of development. Details and individual circumstances of a proposal considered at application stage. Comments noted however no further action considered necessary.

ID	Name	Organisation	Client	Policy Number	Summary of Representation	Changes to make plan legally compliant or sound	RBC Response
					<p>should be extended to cover schools with sixth forms. Schools providing for pupils with learning difficulties and/or disabilities normally have very heavy parking requirements including requirements for their own minibuses etc. and also for the high staff to pupil ratio they have. A policy of two cars per classroom is likely to prove grossly inadequate for special schools. Therefore I believe the parking standard for special schools should also be that each case should be considered on its merits. Where we have a lot of school parking on narrow residential streets we suffer traffic congestion contrary to National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 30.</p>		
1449	Louise Portman	The Wilkes Partnership LLP	University Hospital Coventry	Appendix 5	<p>In terms of the IDP, in the introduction, we would wish to see the heading Acute Health Care changed to Acute and Planned Health Care. Seek the specific inclusion of the Blue Light Access from the University Hospital Coventry Site to the A46 via Walsgrave Hill Farm and included as an infrastructure project on any subsequent CIL Charging Schedule. This scheme should be specified as being a priority given that is strategically</p>	<p>Change heading to see the heading Acute Health Care changed to Acute and Planned Health Care. Seek the specific inclusion of the Blue Light Access from the University Hospital Coventry Site to the A46 via Walsgrave Hill Farm.</p>	<p>Heading title not an issue of soundness. Walsgrave Hill Farm site no longer allocated due to highways constraints and another site coming forward (Lodge Farm) outside of the green belt. No evidence provided that shows direct link from growth in local plan to blue light access or that it isn't already being provided for from other sources of funding.</p>

ID	Name	Organisation	Client	Policy Number	Summary of Representation	Changes to make plan legally compliant or sound	RBC Response
					essential. Will provide evidence for the need as a result of growth of Coventry, Warwick, Stratford and Rugby Local Plan.		