

## Robins, Joel

---

**From:** Smith, Nigel  
**Sent:** 09 May 2019 10:03  
**To:** Planning Department  
**Subject:** FW: 036253 - Consultation 2019/0484  
**Attachments:** Mimecast Attachment Protection Instructions; 036253 Keresley Cov Thompsons consultation.xlsx

**Categories:** Consultation Responses

Please attach both e-mail and excel spreadsheet as 'consultation response – nuneaton and bedworth parks team'

regards

Nigel Smith  
Senior Planning Officer, North Team  
Development Management  
Coventry City Council

T: 024 7697 2272

[Nigel.smith@coventry.gov.uk](mailto:Nigel.smith@coventry.gov.uk)

**Coventry receives 96% of planning applications online** [www.coventry.gov.uk/planning](http://www.coventry.gov.uk/planning)

**Our Building Control team is now back in-house and based here at Coventry.**  
**Phone: 024 7683 2057/2058 or email: [buildingcontrol@coventry.gov.uk](mailto:buildingcontrol@coventry.gov.uk)**

---

**From:** CROSSLEY Matt [mailto:matt.crossley@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk]  
**Sent:** 08 May 2019 19:14  
**To:** Smith, Nigel <Nigel.Smith@coventry.gov.uk>  
**Cc:** HOLLIS Kevin <Kevin.Hollis@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk>; GRANT Darren <darren.grant@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** RE: 036253 - Consultation

Mimecast Attachment Protection has deemed this file to be safe, but always exercise caution when opening files.

---

Thanks Darren.

Hi Nigel – we wouldn't normally try to intrude or encroach on another authorities 'Parks' matters – let alone potential contributions toward parks provision. However in this case the specific geographical position of the development – effectively a significant extension of Keresley – means we feel it is appropriate to consider what parks and play and allotment provision the new residents are most likely to use and hence where the additional demand for and use of that provision may occur and as a result it seems legitimate CIL regulation compliant contributions to provision with Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough are actually relevant to seek in this case.

We would obviously expect to reciprocally apply such an approach if the relationship between new housing and a park nearby in Coventry were reversed. In one sense we already do providing a nature reserve site off Rowleys Green Lane / Silverstone Drive which we have been investing into - and plan larger investments into with adjacent development - which largely serves Coventry residents.

I have to caution that to date I have only seen the illustrative masterplan so am commenting below based on the detail of that alone.

Our normal take on the degree to which residents of housing are served - and what contributions may as a result be applicable is driven by stated distances for 'crow flies' circular catchment areas centered on the nearest provision of 3 different types of Park - 'Destination', 'Community' and 'Local' (- and that approach underpins our adopted Open Space Strategy). When an application is submitted we look at what existing provision is available and what is proposed on site and test if residents will have appropriate access to the 3 types of provision within a suitable distance and if that provision is to a suitable standard.

Applying that approach to this application:

In terms of 'Local Park' Provision (to be available within 400m of residents) - this would typically take the form of on-site provision of recreational land and at least younger children's play provision - somewhat akin to but not exactly the NPFA / FIT 'LEAP' type of provision. As the illustrative masterplan stands the area of open land for play is actually quite limited even for this type of provision - given much of it is occupied by SUDS and what I'm assuming is a retained pond but the detail of that is obviously a matter for your colleagues in Parks at Coventry and I would say on balance that form of provision will be being met on-site given that a play area of some form is shown along with some trim trail provision.

In terms of 'Community Park' provision (to be available within 600m) our assessment is that this is definitely not met on the site. This is somewhat akin to a LEAP/NEAP combination including the provision of teenage provision including a ballcourt + skate / bmx provision and typically a green gym and some landscaped formal 'garden' type areas. Our assessment is that the majority of residents are most likely to use Keresley Recreation Ground for this provision with it lying around 490m to the east of the application site. We are unaware of any provision within Coventry that lies closer that will meet this need? - with Holbrooks park possibly being the nearest such provision at 2.88km distance. We therefore believe it is wholly appropriate to ask for a contribution - as per the attached table to the provision at that site. The table shows contributions as we would calculate them should and application site fall within Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough.

In terms of 'Destination Park' provision (ideally within 1000m but may well be reached by car/public transport) such provision would never normally be met on-site by a single application. Miners Welfare Park in Bedworth is 4.3km away and we don't think any Coventry managed 'Town Park' or 'Country Park' scale parks are any nearer than that? Longford Park is around the same distance but whilst relatively large in scale looks again from aerial photography more to partly meet our Community Park standard / type of provision?

As such we would consider that a contribution either to Miners Welfare Park in Bedworth - or alternatively more locally in some way to the Prologis Country Park as long as that access is evidentially secure in the long term would be appropriate. In terms of our own parks they are assessed against a variant of the national Green Flag standard to determine if provision is adequate or not and Keresley Recreation Ground and Miners Welfare Park do not fully meet those standards. We do not have such an assessment for the Prologis site with it being out of Borough and privately owned but do not believe it for example offers play facilities which would be an expected feature of our equivalent 'Country Park' provision at Whittleford Park in Nuneaton - but of course in that instance Prologis could not be made to manage something additional if they did not want that whereas we offer access to Miners Welfare Park and will utilise sums to improve the 'offer' there.

In terms of allotment provision I am assuming the nearest site will be within Coventry (Watery Lane / Brookford Avenue I think) as we don't have a site immediately in Keresley?

All the above is clearly open to discussion as it is not an absolutely straightforward situation - but we would certainly firmly be of the belief the Community Park level sums would of necessity be invested in Keresley recreation ground. On the Destination park level Prologis Country Park in some ways is the most desirable with some caveats with Miners Welfare Park perhaps being the next best alternative - subject to opportunities I may be unaware of within Coventry?

Obviously I also make these comments blind of how the Parks team in Coventry will have approached the application.

Please ring me as needed etc - or I would be happy to come to meet with you / colleagues / the applicant etc to discuss this further as required.

Thanks –  
Matt (Crossley)

Open Spaces Officer

E-mail: [matt.crossley@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk](mailto:matt.crossley@nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk)  
Tel: (02476) 376429

Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council  
Town Hall,  
Coton Road  
Nuneaton  
CV11 5AA

[www.nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk](http://www.nuneatonandbedworth.gov.uk)

Twitter: @NBBCouncil

**Nuneaton and Bedworth:** the place of choice to live, work & visit

|   | Destination Park Capital contribution  | Destination Park Maintenance contribution                          | Community Park Capital contribution   | Community Park Maintenance contribution | Local Park Capital contribution              | Local Park Maintenance contribution | Allotment Provision                       |            |
|---|--|--|---|---|--|-------------------------------------|---|------------|
| Number of Dwellings                     | 500  | £157,736.53  | £48,541.95  | £269,849.10                             | £79,208.31                                   | £143,883.95                         | £39,088.60                                | £24,848.15 |
| Design & Mgmt Fees (@ 10% Capital Cost) |  | £15,773.65   |   | £26,984.91                              |  | £14,388.39                          |   | £2,484.81  |
| Location for use of sums                | Prologis CP or Miners Welfare Park   | Prologis CP or Miners Welfare Park                                 | Keresley Recreation Ground  | Keresley Recreation Ground              | Omit as onsite and reduce totals accordingly | To Cov CC if adopting               | Cov - Watery Lane / Brookford Allotments? |            |
| Specific use of sums                    | If Miners Welfare Park - events area utility provision, grass reinforcement, southern area path provision, play and natural play trail provision | To maintain same items   | Skate provision, BMX extension, Teenage provision, path circuit, avenue planting, signage provision and info board provision, habitat creation, bike stand provision, landscaping | To maintain same items                  | Cov to determine                             | To maintain same items              | Cov to determine                          |            |
| Capital Total                           | £596,317.73  | N.B. Reduce all sums by Local Park amounts due to onsite provision |   |   |  |                                     |   |            |
| Maintenance Total                       | £166,838.86  |  |   |   |  |                                     |   |            |
| Design & Mgmt fees Cost                 | £59,631.77   |  |   |   |  |                                     |   |            |
| Total                                   | £822,788.36  |  |   |   |  |                                     |   |            |