



**REPORT FOR:**  
**WARWICKSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**  
**NUNEATON AND BEDWORTH MASTERPLAN**  
**PUBLIC CONSULTATION ON COLLEGES' OPTION**

**Prepared for**  
**Mandy Walker, Manager Regenerations Project Group**

**4<sup>th</sup> April 2008**

**Prepared by:**

ERS Research  
33 Clarendon Road  
London, N8 0NW

**Contacts:**

John Hearn  
020 8365 8909  
[john.hearn@electoralreform](mailto:john.hearn@electoralreform)

**JN G650**



---

1	Executive summary .....	3
2	Background and overview of methodology .....	5
3	Survey findings .....	7
	Appendices .....	20
	Appendix 1: The questionnaire	

# 1 Executive summary

## Overall support

Amongst our respondents:

- The proportion opposing the proposed co-location outweighs the proportion who expressed their support by a narrow margin (47% and 46% respectively).
- Younger respondents are markedly more likely than older ones to have expressed support; 78% of those under 18 and 71% of those aged 18 to 29 either support or strongly support the co-location. In contrast, 71% of those aged 60 and above oppose.
- Amongst respondents living in postal areas CV10, CV11 and CV12, the proportion in favour (41%) is outweighed by that in opposition (52%). Amongst those in other postal areas, a majority of 79% expressed support.

## Key issues and concerns

- Traffic and parking. The predicted negative effect that this development will have on the roads of Nuneaton was the main subject cited by respondents at the question relating to likely disadvantages (traffic problems by 38%, parking problems by 22%). These are both regarded by many as existing problems that will worsen.
- Education in Nuneaton. This subject did not feature as prominently as others, given that the proposal relates to local colleges. That the development would improve the education available locally was the most commonly held view amongst respondents who identified particular advantages (32%, with 17% referring to the improved facilities available to students and the same proportion stating that it will give students easier access to a wider range of courses). Amongst those who recorded disadvantages, just 8% stated that the development would impact negatively on education, this disadvantage falling behind town centre disruption and overcrowding (18%) and crime and anti-social behaviour (14%).

- Effect of the co-location on the town centre. This was another recurrent theme throughout the survey and there are several themes relating to this which respondents focussed on. Amongst those who commented on potential advantages for the town centre (15%), 10% stated that local businesses stand to benefit and jobs may be created as a result of all of these extra potential customers being close to the town centre. In contrast, 18% identified potential problems relating to disruption and overcrowding in the town centre with two thirds of this group commenting in general terms about this whilst much smaller proportions referred to other potential difficulties such as current shop users experiencing difficulty. Anti-social behaviour is a related issue; 11% raised the spectre of intimidating groups or gangs of teenagers making life unpleasant for others in the centre of Nuneaton.

## 2 Background and overview of methodology

Warwickshire County Council commissioned ERS research to analyse the results of a consultation exercise that the council had conducted amongst residents living in the Nuneaton area on a proposal to co-locate the North Warwickshire and Hinckley College and the King Edward VI College to a shared site in Nuneaton town centre.

Manned public exhibitions were held on the co-location proposals between Thursday, 28<sup>th</sup> February and Saturday, 1<sup>st</sup> March 2008 at the Town Hall (for the first two exhibition days) and in the Market Square (for the third).

Respondents could participate by completing either paper questionnaires or by submitting an internet questionnaire which was hosted by Warwickshire County Council. The questionnaire was designed by Warwickshire County Council, although ERS did provide advice on questionnaire design and layout.

Questionnaires were distributed by Nuneaton and Bedworth Borough Council to the public through a variety of different means; a number were sent to groups on the council's consultation database and local libraries were supplied with quantities. Members of the public could request questionnaires and they were available to those visiting the manned public exhibitions. These questionnaires could be returned either by ERS addressed first class replied paid envelopes, or, alternatively, deposited into an ERS ballot box which was provided, locked to prevent the possibility of tampering, to the council.

Responses completed on the internet were captured by Warwickshire County Council. A data file of these responses was provided to ERS after the survey cut off and these were merged with the data from the paper survey.

At the cut off date of Friday, 14<sup>th</sup> March a total of 2801 completed surveys were received by ERS. This included 722 internet responses. This gives a response rate of approximately 40%, this being based on a estimated distribution figure for paper questionnaires of 7000.


During the course of the exercise, several slightly different variations of the questionnaire were produced by the council. The breakdown of the numbers received of these different types is as follows:

Type I, Initial print run, distinguishing features including Nuneaton & Bedworth coat of arms in top right hand corner of page 1 without 'United to Achieve' phrase included	1018
Type II, Same as above, but including the 'United to Achieve' phrase and with minor changes in positioning of tick boxes etc	641
Type III, This with marked differences in the positions of tick boxes etc and smaller boxes for the councils' logos and coats of arms	420

### 3 Survey findings

Chart 1: Do you support or oppose the proposal for the college co-location campus for Nuneaton town centre?


Base: All respondents (2801)



The overall split between those who support and those who oppose the proposal to co-locate the two colleges to Nuneaton town centre is pretty close with 46% supporting this and 47% opposing. Just 7% of all respondents either stated that they neither support nor oppose this plan or did not give an answer at this question.

Chart 2: Younger respondents are more likely to support the proposal?

Base: All respondents in each age bracket (2647)




■ Net support ■ Net neither/not stated ■ Net oppose

The likelihood of supporting this proposal drops with age as the chart above demonstrates; a majority of respondents up to the age of 44 are in support (although this majority is smaller amongst higher age bands). Those aged between 45 and 59 are evenly split, whilst amongst those aged 60 and over the majority against is decisive.

Chart 3: Respondents in CV10, CV11 and CV12 more likely to oppose?

Base: All respondents in each postal area (2443)



The proportion of respondents who oppose the co-location plan in postal areas CV10 11 and 12 outweighs the proportion who expressed support in all instances. By contrast, almost four respondents in five in other postal areas stated that they support this development.

**Table 1: What advantages would you expect from a co-located college campus serving Nuneaton and the wider area?**

	total
<i>Base: all Respondents</i>	2801
	%
<b>NET: Improvements in Education in Nuneaton</b>	<b>32</b>
This development will provide students with better resources / facilities, e.g. a new library, improved IT etc.	17
This development would provide students with easier access to and a greater choice of courses / will improve education in Nuneaton generally	17
This development would reduce running costs, making better use of the resources	4
This development would create a more unified student body removing the perceived two tier educational system which currently exists	2
This development will mean a more spacious college	1
King Edward's will survive/continue to provide high quality education	>1
<b>NET: Negative Comments</b>	<b>29</b>
No advantages will be brought to Nuneaton and the wider area by this development	17
None / no issues	7
The concept of this development is not a problem, but the proposed location is	6
Traffic/parking issues will not be solved by this development	1
This development would lead to an increase of anti-social behaviour / unwanted 'gang' behaviour / intimidating students	>1
General negative comment, e.g. 'Not for it', 'This is a stupid idea' etc	>1
The planned development is motivated by financial gain above anything else, e.g. the sell off of land for house building purposes	>1
Only pubs and fast food outlets, which are tempting to otherwise low spending students, will benefit	>1

Concerns that these plans clash with proposals of other schools to open 6th form colleges	>1
<b>NET: Improvements to the Town Centre and Economic Benefits</b>	<b>15</b>
This development will help generate more business in the town centre (and create more jobs)	10
This development will revitalise the town centre	7
This development will give students easier access to the town and it's facilities - it's more centrally located	1
Nuneaton will benefit from the money being offered as part of this proposal	>1
Improved/more aesthetically pleasing buildings	>1
This development might improve the nightlife in Nuneaton	>1
<b>NET: Impact on Traffic and Travel</b>	<b>9</b>
This development would reduce travel for students	5
This development will mean better / increased parking	2
Traffic/parking issues will not be solved by this development	1
This development will improve traffic / reduce problems on the roads	>1
The development must/will incorporate improved public transport and/or park and ride	>1
<b>NET: General Arguments and Comments in Favour</b>	<b>6</b>
This development will benefit people in the area / it is a good idea, generally	3
This development would raise Nuneaton's profile and status	2
General positive comment, e.g. 'I think this is what Nuneaton needs', 'Go for it' etc	1
This development will improve diversity	1
<b>NET: Other Topics</b>	<b>&gt;1</b>
Better security e.g. more secure buildings	>1
Environmental benefits, e.g. lower carbon footprint etc.	>1

<b>NET: Other one off comments, Don't knows, Invalid comments, Etc</b>	<b>3</b>
Other	2
Don't know /Cannot think of any issues	>1
Response not applicable / invalid	1
<b>Net: Not Stated</b>	<b>27</b>

Almost a third of respondents made comments relating to an improvement in education in Nuneaton resulting from this development (32%). 17% cited an improvement in educational facilities such as newer buildings, a new library etc whilst an identical proportion stated that improved access to a wider range of courses would mean better education in the town generally.

29% made negative comments. The most frequently recorded was that this development carries no advantages for the area (17%).

15% talked about improvements to the town centre and economic benefits to Nuneaton. This included 10% of all respondents who focussed on increased business to the town centre plus the possible knock on in terms of job creation.

Further analysis reveals that:

- of the 1292 (46%) who expressed support or strong support for the proposed co-location, 29% cited better resources/facilities, an identical proportion stated that it will lead to easier access to a wider range of courses which will help to improve education on offer in Nuneaton, whilst 17% recorded the opinion that it will generate more business in the town centre and may help create jobs;
- of the 1309 (47%) who oppose or strongly oppose the proposed co-location, 35% feel that it will bring no advantages to Nuneaton and the wider area, 15% stated that they could identify no advantages whilst 12% recorded the opinion that they are not against the proposal per se, rather they feel that the town centre location is problematic.

**Table 2: What disadvantages would you expect from a co-located college campus?**

	total
<i>Base: all Respondents</i>	2801
	%
<b>NET: Problems on the roads</b>	<b>45</b>
This development would lead to traffic problems in the area	38
This development would lead to parking problems in the area	22
Park & ride would not be an effective means to tackle traffic problems	1
This development would lead to increased traffic accidents	1
Negative effect for the emergency services	1
This development may lead to unwanted parking charges being established	1
Development will have a negative effect on public transport	>1
<b>NET: Town centre disruption and overcrowding</b>	<b>18</b>
This development would lead to an overcrowding of the town centre	12
This development would inconvenience shoppers in the town / may lead to people shopping elsewhere	3
Chaos / disruption in the town centre, generally	3
Disruption would occur in the local area during the building phase	1
<b>NET: Crime and anti-social behaviour</b>	<b>14</b>
This development would lead to an increase of anti-social behaviour / unwanted 'gang' behaviour / intimidating students	11
This development would lead to an increase in litter	4
There will be safety implications, e.g. increased risk of mugging (especially in the evenings)	>1
<b>NET: Generally positive comments</b>	<b>10</b>
None / no issues	9
Any problems would be minor/surmountable/short term only	1
Criticism of those opposing the development	>1
General positive comment, e.g. 'I think this is what Nuneaton needs', 'Go for it' etc	>1
<b>NET: Negative effects on education</b>	<b>8</b>
Co-located college campus would lead to a loss of college identity, e.g. the disappearance of King Edward's	3
A co-located college campus would lead to a reduction of educational opportunities	3
The proposed site is too small to accommodate both campuses	2

Large size of the proposed college is a disadvantage, e.g. some students will find it daunting	>1
Development will have negative effect on the competitiveness of students	>1
Development will have negative effects for other local schools and colleges	>1
<b>NET: Negative effect on town's facilities</b>	<b>5</b>
Negative effect on library service, e.g. fear over it's future	5
The development will effect St Nicholas Parish Church detrimentally	>1
Unpleasant/less aesthetically pleasing buildings	>1
<b>NET: Negative effects on local environment</b>	<b>3</b>
This development would have a negative effect on the 'market town' image of the area	1
Increased noise/pollution	1
The planned development would have a negative effect on 'green spaces'	1
Concern over what will happen to existing college buildings/sites	>1
<b>NET: Negative comments relating to the council and their motives</b>	<b>1</b>
This development is a waste of tax payers' money	1
The planned development is motivated by financial gain above anything else, e.g. the sell off of land for house building purposes	>1
The planned development is a rush job which has not allowed for enough debate / I do not trust the council	>1
<b>NET: Other topics</b>	<b>5</b>
The concept of the development is not a problem, but the location is	2
General negative comment, e.g. 'Not for it', 'This is a stupid idea' etc	1
Only pubs and fast food outlets, which are tempting to otherwise low spending students, will benefit	>1
(Risk of) job losses	>1
Request that different facilities be built on the site / with the money, e.g. snow dome, theatre etc	>1
Feel that the current set up is OK/works well as it is	>1
Request for specific things to be included as part of the development - a 'wish list'	>1
Supporting use of public transport/cycling/walking must be part of the development	>1
This development will cause problems for the disabled	>1
Criticism of students, e.g. dress, smell etc	>1
<b>NET: Other one off comments, don't knows, invalid comments etc</b>	<b>4</b>

Other	2
Don't know /Cannot think of any issues	1
Response not applicable / invalid	1
<b>NET: Not stated</b>	<b>27</b>

Nine respondents in 20 raised road related issues or problems as being disadvantages of the proposed co-location (45%). 38% focussed on general traffic problems whilst 22% commented on possible parking problems (with a number of these saying that this is already a problem in the area which would be exacerbated by the move).

18% raised concerns about disruption and overcrowding in the town centre with two thirds of this group focussing on the possibility of Nuneaton becoming overcrowded (12%).

Concerns relating to crime and anti-social behaviour were raised by 14% of respondents. The biggest concern here is that it the area around the college will be subject to large groups of teenagers behaving in a manner that is felt to be threatening or anti-social by respondents.

One respondent in 10 overall recorded a positive response at this question.

Further analysis reveals that:

- of the 1292 (46%) who expressed support or strong support for the proposed co-location, 18% simply recorded that there are no disadvantages to this proposal, whilst 17% stated that the development will lead to increased traffic problems in the area and 9% commented on the likelihood of increased parking problems resulting;
- of the 1309 (47%) who oppose or strongly oppose the proposed co-location, 58% felt that the development will lead to increased traffic problems in the area, whilst 34% cited parking problems. 18% expressed concern over overcrowding in the town whilst an identical proportion raised the issue of anti-social and intimidating gangs of students dominating the area.

**Table 3: Any additional comments?**

	total
<i>Base: all Respondents</i>	2801
	%
<b>NET: What I would like the development to incorporate / the money spent on</b>	<b>18</b>
Should build on other sites, e.g. Hinckley Road, existing Hinckley and North Warwickshire college site	14
Request that different facilities be built on the site / with the money, e.g. snow dome, theatre etc	3
Supporting use of public transport/cycling/walking must be part of the development	1
Request for specific things to be included as part of the development - a 'wish list'	1
The building must be aesthetically pleasing	>1
Suggestions for alternative schemes	>1
Development must be environmentally friendly, e.g. incorporate energy saving features	>1
<b>NET: Problems on the roads</b>	<b>10</b>
This development would lead to parking and traffic problems in the area	8
Park & ride would not be an effective means to tackle traffic problems	1
There is a greater need to sort out the ring road / bypass issue rather than this development	1
This development may lead to unwanted parking charges being established	>1
This development would lead to increased traffic accidents	>1
The development needs to address all (road) safety concerns	>1
Negative effect for the emergency services	>1
Development will have a negative effect on public transport	>1
<b>NET: Negative comments relating to the council and their motives</b>	<b>9</b>
The planned development is a rush job which has not allowed for enough debate / I do not trust the council	3
The planned development is motivated by financial gain above anything else, e.g. the sell off of land for house building purposes	3
The council have already decided - this is a 'done deal'	2
This development is a waste of tax payers' money	1
Information needs to be presented in full and by both sides before the public decides	>1
Those making this decision do not live in Nuneaton, so they won't have to live with the consequences	>1

<b>NET: Generally positive comments</b>	<b>9</b>
General positive comment, e.g. 'I think this is what Nuneaton needs', 'Go for it' etc	5
This development is needed to regenerate / modernise the town	4
Criticism of those opposing the development	>1
<b>NET: Negative effects on the town's facilities</b>	<b>4</b>
Negative effect on library service, e.g. fear over it's future	4
The development will effect St Nicholas Parish Church detrimentally	>1
<b>NET: Generally negative comments</b>	<b>4</b>
General negative comment, e.g. 'Not for it', 'This is a stupid idea' etc	3
Feel that the current set up is OK/works well as it is	1
<b>NET: Town centre distribution and overcrowding</b>	<b>3</b>
This development would inconvenience shoppers in the town / may lead to people	2
This development would lead to an overcrowding of the town centre	1
Chaos / disruption in the town centre, generally	>1
<b>NET: Crime and anti-social behaviour</b>	<b>3</b>
This development would lead to an increase of anti-social behaviour / unwanted 'gang' behaviour / intimidating students	2
This development would lead to an increase in litter	>1
Concern that merging the two will cause trouble between the two groups of students	>1
<b>NET: Negative effects on the local environment</b>	<b>2</b>
This development would have a negative effect on the 'market town' image of the area / no advantage for the town	1
The planned development would have a negative effect on 'green spaces'	>1
Concern over what will happen to existing college buildings/sites	>1
Feel that the 'modern building' argument is a bit of a red herring, e.g. would you knock down Oxford's colleges?	>1
<b>NET: Few or no benefits for business</b>	<b>2</b>
This development would inconvenience shoppers in the town / may lead to people	2
Only pubs and fast food outlets, which are tempting to otherwise low spending students, will benefit	>1
Feel that the argument that the development will generate business is a bit of a red herring	>1
<b>NET: Negative effects on or concerns about education in Nuneaton</b>	<b>2</b>
Concerned about a loss of quality education should King Edward's be merged	1
Feel that a site in town would be too small/restrictive/unable to grow should it	>1

need to	
Would like some say on the subjects taught, to whom and when	>1
Feel that this scheme will damage education on offer in Nuneaton	>1
Personally think that other schools and colleges in the area are better/worth additional investment	>1
The answer to this is simply to limit entry to local colleges	>1
<b>NET: Improvements in education in Nuneaton</b>	<b>2</b>
Feel that this scheme will improve education on offer in Nuneaton	1
In favour of a single, central college, generally	>1
King Edward's will survive/continue to provide high quality education	>1
This development would reduce running costs, making better use of the resources of the two colleges	>1
<b>NET: Other one off comments, don't know, invalid comments etc</b>	<b>7</b>
Other	2
None / no issues	3
Don't know / Cannot think of any issues	>1
Response not applicable / invalid	1
<b>NET: Not Stated</b>	<b>45</b>

18% of respondents requested that either particular aspects be incorporated into the development or that the money be used for some other scheme. The most frequently offered suggestion was that other sites be used for the co-located college such as Hinckley Road.

One respondent in 10 raised the issue of problems on the roads, with 8% returning to parking and traffic problems (these had been identified as major concerns at the previous question).

Further analysis reveals that:

- of the 1292 (46%) who expressed support or strong support for the proposed co-location, 10% recorded positive and optimistic comments (e.g. 'go for it', 'do it!' etc) whilst 8% stated that the development is needed to revitalise or regenerate the town;
- of the 1309 (47%) who oppose or strongly oppose the proposed co-location, 27% recommended using other sites such as Hinckley Road instead, whilst 14% fear that the development will generate traffic and parking problems.

# Appendices

---

Appendix 1 - The questionnaire