

REPORT TO CABINET

REPORT OF: M Sibthorp; Head of Planning Policy & Economic Regeneration

REPORT NO. PLA.533

DATE: 10th October 2005

TITLE:	TOWN CENTRE ACTION PLAN – CONSULTATION DRAFT REPORT OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED AND PROPOSED CHANGES
FORWARD PLAN ITEM:	YES
DATE WHEN FIRST APPEARED IN FORWARD PLAN:	16.06.05
KEY DECISION OR POLICY FRAMEWORK PROPOSAL:	Key Decision

COUNCIL AIMS/PORTFOLIO HOLDER NAME AND DESIGNATION:	Councillor John Smith Economic Development Portfolio
CORPORATE PRIORITY:	Town Centres (A); Planning & Conservation (B); Car parks (B); Street Scene (A); Anti-Social Behaviour (A); Business development (B)
CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS:	Some of the proposed actions will positively address crime and disorder issues
FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT IMPLICATIONS:	None
BACKGROUND PAPERS:	Cabinet Report PLA.518 Town Centre Action Plan 11 th July 2005

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT AND SUMMARY

At the meeting of 11th July 2005, Cabinet considered a draft Town Centre Action Plan, which set out a broad range of actions relating to the town centre 'A' priority. The document, with a number of small modifications was approved for consultation purposes.

2. DETAILS OF REPORT

The consultation is now complete. Some 15 representations have been received concerning the action plan. Additionally some 13 representations have been received specifically relating to the Welland Quarter site in Stamford.

A summary of the representations received, a commentary thereon, and details of any relevant amendments to the report are set out in the table appended to this report.

Cabinet members will have been sent under separate cover full copies of the representations received, and copies have also been deposited in the Cabinet Room and Members Lounge.

RECOMMENDATION: Cabinet are invited to endorse the modifications recommended within the attached schedule , and to approve the Town Centre Action Plan, as amended, as the basis for future town centre activity.

3.CONTACT:

Mike Sibthorp
Head of Planning Policy & Economic Regeneration
Tel: 01476 406472

TOWN CENTRE ACTION PLAN CONSULTATION DRAFT

SUMMARY OF REPRESENTATIONS RECEIVED

No	From	Summary of comments	HPPER Comments	Recommended modification
1	SKDC Economic Development and Scrutiny Panel	The Minutes from this meeting have been circulated. No specific actions or recommendations arise from their consideration of the report, although there appears to be a general support for the document and the proposed actions.	None	None
GRANTHAM				
2	Grantham TCMP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General satisfaction for the document. Support the need to establish a more robust TCMP membership, and move towards a CIC structure Support for a review of the Masterplan, particularly if CIC structure established 	General support for proposed actions.	None
3	J Knowles	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for document Welcomes Grantham Transport Study. Need to dovetail in with any Masterplanning exercise. Fundamental issue remains the railway bridges. Supports visitor economy initiatives; emphasis upon St Wulfram's precincts and riverside areas. Also, links between town and Gonerby Moor and vice versa Need to look at improvements to Wide Westgate Support for Canal basin project Questions merit of rail halt proposal 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> In order to capture relationships between masterplan and transport study, and in order to capture the broader under-performing sub-regional centre issues, there appears to be merit in broadening masterplan review to whole town whilst still including important town centre specific issues. Wide Westgate and riverside issues capable of being addressed within Masterplan review 	Amend Action 10 (Page 21) to refer to a town-wide masterplan; textual amendments to reflect this change.
4	Grantham Civic Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Support Canal basin initiative Support Market Place pedestrianisation initiative Support Vine Street pedestrianisation (not included in report) General support for Welham Street MSCP subject to appropriate design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Vine Street capable of being addressed within Masterplan review 	None

5	Gladys Foster	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Purchase of St Vincent's for a Dambuster's Museum Need to reflect needs of disabled groups in town centre Retention of Conduit Lane car park 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Conduit Lane CP has been recognised as an important opportunity area in the town, and its inclusion in the document as such is considered important St Vincent's not within town centre 	Amend text Page 18 to refer to potential of including other adjacent land (r/o Wesgate) as part of any regeneration of the Conduit Lane site
6	Sue Mallinson	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General concerns re loss of important buildings for redevelopment (specifically Grantley Street) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Not directly covered by action plan; more appropriately dealt with as an LDF issue 	None
STAMFORD				
7	Stamford Vision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for document. Gateway scheme should be listed as part of core activities. Evening economy and visitor economy issues; need for joint approach 	None	None
8	Stamford Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> General support for SKDC approach to town centres and TCMP's Concerns expressed re: composition of TCMP's and low-count of democratically elected representatives . recommend 2 Town Councillor representatives on TCMP & Committees Need for Town Council representation on working groups (eg. car parking, evening economy, LDF) Stamford Vision had a wider range of activity than purely town centre issues Any decision of TCMP should be subject of agreement by Town and District Council Recommend amendment to Action 22; delete 'support its appraisal' Welland Quarter development would need to be supported by new relevant infrastructure particularly roads New hotel potential not confined to Welland Quarter 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It is considered that there is appropriate elected representation at all levels (County, District, Town) Town Council included in Car Park working group. Other groups not yet determined or formed Primary town centre focus This is considered to be inappropriate Action refers only to the need to properly appraise the proposals from a highways perspective and a planning perspective. There is no adopted Council position on the road proposals at this time 	<p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p>

9	Stamford Chamber of Trade and Commerce	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Town Centre Action Plan should extend beyond the five priorities identified by Stamford Vision • Chamber identifies six priorities for the town; • Traffic problems; Chamber feel their Eastern relief Road proposals should have been more fully covered within the report • Car parking; Council should support Chamber's strategy and policy in relation to car parks, car parking charges and the proposed North Street underground CP proposal. • Development opportunity sites; North Street(as part of car parking proposal) but potentially extending beyond car park to east; Cattle market site; particularly western end – potential hotel / convention centre; Welland Quarter; • Protection of the riverside and provision of rights of way • Refurbishment of paving in the pedestrian precinct • The need to find a beneficial use for st john's church; community based use – possible TIC 	<p>Its is considered important to firstly properly appraise the highways and planning merits of the scheme. Action 22 properly records this position</p> <p>The car park review is presently underway. It is considered premature to pre-empt the outcomes of that study</p> <p>The potential of each of these sites is recognised, but cannot be divorced from the outcomes of the parking review.</p> <p>Potential to identify opportunities following car park study, within LDF / Action area plan</p> <p>Most appropriately considered through LDF / AAP</p> <p>This appears a reasonable long term ambition. Text of plan could be amended and additional action added, to refer to the need to identify and prioritise areas for public realm enhancement following implementation of the gateway scheme</p> <p>St John's Church issue; important to identify viable long term use, but not considered appropriate as a specific action within TCAP</p>	<p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>None</p> <p>Amend text and insert additional action to refer to the need to identify and prioritise other public realm projects</p> <p>None</p>
10	Stamford Civic Society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient reference to the importance of maintaining built fabric and public realm • Support initiatives to address evening economy issues 	<p>This is an important issue. Textual changes to acknowledge importance</p>	<p>Textual changes to acknowledge conservation and public realm issues</p>

11	B Foster, 4 Exeter Court, St Peter's Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Gateway scheme goes 'too far' Lack of accountability of TCMP's; less support for TCMP than suggested 	No comment TCMP's are accountable.	None
12	Bourne TCMP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports restructuring of TCMP Supports need for a wider membership of stakeholders Supports the establishment of a business club Proposes certain amendments to commentary on Action Plan in Appendix 8 	These additions are acknowledged and amendments are appropriate	Amend appendix 8 to reflect additional actions completed
13	Bourne Town Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concern that CIC-structures will reduce accountability Concern that establishment of a business club will override existing established organisations Need to review terms of reference Support review of Town Centre Action Plan subject to appropriate Town Council consultation 	<p>CIC-structures will need to be accountable to its constituent organisations and the community at large</p> <p>If practicable Business Club will build upon any existing organisation rather than replicate it</p> <p>Agreed</p>	None
14	Crown walk Property, Bourne	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Plan should focus on broader issues beyond core area; eg. pedestrianisation Impact of core area development on town centre needs to be considered Impact of core area on medieval grain of town New car parking provision is fundamental 	<p>Impact assessment will be submitted as part of any future planning application</p> <p>Car parking review proposed in plan in tandem with core area redevelopment</p> <p>Core area scheme relates well to historic structure of town</p>	None
DEEPINGS				
15	DSJ Parish Council	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Broadly support Actions 1-9 on functions of TCMP's. ction, not Action Plans Support actions in relation to The Deepings; SKDC funding for TC Manager as well as s.106 money Support extension of BID's to the Deepings 	None	None

WELLAND QUARTER				
No	Name	Issues raised	HPPER Comments	Recommended changes
1	M Woodall, 6 Priory Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Unnecessary and undesirable development • Costs of development exceed advantages • Priory should not be surrounded by 'urban sprawl' • Increased traffic • Infrastructure and community facilities already overloaded 	<p>The Welland Quarter has been identified, since the 2002 Local Plan Deposit Draft as an 'Opportunity Area'. The text of the Action Plan document identifies the underused nature of much of the site, and the potential to deliver a genuinely mixed use development that would provide quality employment opportunities, leisure opportunities, and housing.</p>	<p>No changes recommended. Textual modifications to reflect issues raised by objectors that will require careful consideration in the detailed masterplanning phase.</p>
2	H M Butler, 24 Priory Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Priory Road already congested • Concern about potential loss of Wharf Road car park • Services already overloaded • Adverse impact upon historic town 	<p>Work completed to date, in partnership with Stamford Vision, has identified that a comprehensive redevelopment scheme is likely to be viable. Any such development would be private sector led, and is not likely to involve the use of significant public resources as suggested in the letters of objection.</p>	
3	P W Heath, 9 Adelaide Street	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Detimental to fabric of historic town • Traffic already too congested • Town should be protected 		
4	L Thistleton, 29 Priory Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of site is green-field; should not be developed • Traffic flows on Priory Road already excessive • Much of site is flood plain • High voltage overhead lines cross the site – concerns about electro-magnetic fields • Loss of allotments 	<p>There are recognised constraints and issues on the site that will need to be addressed. In my view, these do not represent absolute barriers to development, but issues that need to be carefully considered and incorporated into any future redevelopment proposals.</p>	
5	J Matthews, 4 Princes Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much of site is flood plain • Cost on the public purse excessive • Adverse environmental impact • Additional traffic • No need for the development • Adverse impact upon St Leonard's Priory 	<p>As identified in the Action Plan, the next stage of the process, now that the basic viability of the scheme has been confirmed, is to proceed to a more detailed master planning phase that will very carefully need to consider the issues and constraints of the type identified by objectors. Access arrangements for example will be a critically important issue. It is anticipated that the masterplanning phase will then lead to the development of a planning brief for the site, and the preparation of</p>	
6	M Belton, 35 Warrenne Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No need for the development • Sewerage facilities can't cope • Better use of resources 		
7	Rev D B & Mrs Hartley Beggars Roost, Priory Rd	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Concur with objections of Mrs A Woods(below) • Development of flood plain 		

8	Mrs A Woods, Hudds Mill, Uffington Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increases in vehicular traffic Half of area is designated floodplain Excessive decontamination costs Adverse impact upon St Leonard's Priory Excessive public cost Stamford does not need the additional jobs that would be created Existing employment sites exist 	<p>supplementary planning guidance. It is anticipated that there will be full consultation throughout this process and the opportunity to inform the masterplanning of the site.</p> <p>It is considered that the site remains an important opportunity for Stamford, and one which needs to be developed further. No changes are recommended at this stage, but textual changes are suggested to reflect the issues and objections raised in representations that will require careful consideration.</p>	
9	D Grove, 3 Kings Mill Lane	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Concerns about traffic impact, impact upon floodplain and the effect upon the setting of St Leonard's Priory Scale of development incompatible with the character of Stamford 		
10	M & D Aspinall, 28 Priory Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse traffic impacts upon Priory Road Loss of allotments Overhead lines – health implications Development in the flood plain 		
11	H Payne, 39 Warrene Keep	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Adverse traffic impact Pressure upon public services Impact upon the setting of the priory 		
12	S Watkins, 39 Priory Road	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Increased traffic Impact on floodplain Impact upon the priory Loss of allotments Duplicate existing facilities nearby 		
13	N Gray, 9 Priory Graden	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Supports representations made by A Woods 		