



Talbot Gateway  
Draft Planning Brief  
Consultation

2006



2004-2005  
Benefits Administration

**BLACKPOOL BOROUGH COUNCIL**  
**REPORT of the**  
**HEAD OF PLANNING AND TRANSPORTATION**  
**To The EXECUTIVE**  
**18<sup>th</sup> OCTOBER 2006**  
**On the**  
**TALBOT GATEWAY PLANNING BRIEF**  
**CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS ON THE DRAFT DOCUMENT**

The Draft Talbot Gateway Supplementary Planning Document (SPD) was approved by Executive in June 2006 for public participation. Under the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004, the Talbot Gateway SPD will form part of the Local Development Framework and its preparation is set out in the Council's Local Development Scheme for completion in 2006/7.

The SPD provides the Council's detailed planning guidance for the future development of the Talbot Gateway. Alongside the development of the Casino Leisure Quarter, it is at the heart of the Resort Masterplan in seeking to secure comprehensive redevelopment of the site and help support a much enhanced town centre offer.

After the successful marketing of the site at the beginning of the year by the Council and ReBlackpool URC, three potential developer partners were selected to prepare their proposals for the Talbot Gateway. Following consideration of their respective submissions at the end of the year, the Council will select its chosen developer partner in January 2007. The adopted Talbot Gateway SPD will guide the eventual chosen developer partner in making subsequent detailed planning applications for the comprehensive redevelopment of the site.

Consultation took place on the draft SPD for a six week period ending on August 19<sup>th</sup> 2006 including the three potential developer partners, organisations and landowners, as well as local residents and businesses within the immediate vicinity of the site. The content of the draft Planning Brief was informed by earlier consultation on a Scoping Document, produced by the Council in March 2006. A detailed Sustainability Appraisal of the SPD was also undertaken and made publicly available as part of the consultation process.

The Purpose of this report is:

- ◆ To provide details of representations received on the draft SPD.
- ◆ To consider the Council's response to those representations.
- ◆ To recommend changes for approval as the adopted Talbot Gateway SPD.

## **2 CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS AND PROPOSED CHANGES**

The remainder of this report considers the issues raised by representations and where appropriate recommends changes to the SPD. A total of 24 different individuals and organisations made 112 representations on the content of the Draft SPD during the consultation period ending on August 19<sup>th</sup> 2006. This included responses from ReBlackpool and the three selected developer partners (Carillion, St Modwen, and Amec).

Full details of each of the individual representations, their consideration by officers and any recommended changes to the SPD as a consequence of the representations are set out in Appendix A to this report. Details of other recommended changes to update the document are set out in Appendix B to this report.

This covering report summarises some of the key issues raised by the representations, but it is an important part of the consultation process that all representations made on the SPD should be considered by the Council.

### **General**

ReBlackpool, GONW, the NWRDA and Lancashire County Council all expressed their support for the main content of the guidance as a key component of the Resort Masterplan, while making a number of specific representations on more detailed aspects of the draft Brief. Whilst supporting the thrust of the guidance, the three shortlisted potential development partners (Carillion, Amec and St Modwens) also made a number of specific comments on the draft Brief.

### **Vision and Key Design Principles**

Some clarification of the overall vision for the area is sought by Lancashire County Council. ReBlackpool URC similarly seeks further clarification on the Council's aspirations for the character of the area.

More specific issues were raised by ReBlackpool and Amec regarding the need for clearer guidance on the appropriate scale and height of buildings catering for different uses and locations within the development.

The basis of the approach adopted in the draft SPD has been to set out the key criteria that are important to inform design so as to secure an appropriate layout. It is considered the design principles set out in the draft SPD will help secure a seamless extension of the town centre into the Talbot Gateway, whilst providing the flexibility for a creative approach which recognises the importance of the area as a potential landmark development gateway to the town centre and resort. It remains the view that it is for the developers design teams to respond to this framework rather than for the SPD to provide detailed prescriptive guidance.

However, in response to these representations a number of clarifications are recommended should be made to Section 2 "Vision for the Future", Section 5.9 "Appropriate Uses" and Section 7 of the draft SPD on Design Principles.

## **Redevelopment Issues**

Concerns were expressed regarding specific redevelopment issues in a number of representations, including the future of the Talbot Road Bus Station, the Indoor Bowls Hall, the Wilkinson Store, and other existing building frontages.

Changes are therefore recommended to the SPD by the inclusion of a new summary section to more clearly set out those areas where redevelopment would be actively encouraged (including Blackpool North Station, Talbot Road Bus Station and Wilkinsons) and those areas where the Council would wish to see buildings retained.

Precisely which areas/ buildings may be included in any eventual redevelopment, however, is not determined by the SPD and will only be determined as part of the eventual preparation of detailed development proposals by the Council's eventual selected developer partner.

It is accepted that the SPD is not in itself a sufficient basis to justify a compelling case for the use of CPO powers, but is part of a comprehensive approach to guide proposals for development. It will require detailed proposals progressed in conjunction with the statutory basis provided by the Local Plan and Talbot Gateway SPD to provide any necessary basis for CPO powers.

It is therefore recommended in response to representations that additional reference should also be included in the SPD requiring a clear "relocation strategy" to be part and parcel of the proposals to be produced by the Council's eventual selected developer partner for existing uses within the site.

Specific clarification on the Bowls Hall can now be included in the Brief following the report to Executive in June 2006 which resolved that its retention would not be required within the site.

## **Retail Development**

Both Amec and Carillion have made representations regarding the need for more flexibility regarding the provision of new retail development and consider the current approach set out in the draft SPD is too restrictive. Blackpool Town Centre BID raises concerns that the scale of proposed retail development may detract from the retail offer in the rest of the town centre.

The basic retail stance in the SPD is fully reflective of existing policy set out in the recently adopted Local Plan, with the need being to strengthen and integrate with the existing town centre. However, in response to representations, a proposed change to the SPD is recommended to clarify that all proposals will be judged against policy based on their overall merit. It is also recommended that additional recognition is included in the SPD of the role that restaurants, cafes and other ancillary uses perform in adding to the vitality of an area.

## **Housing**

ReBlackpool URC and Amec both call for a relaxation of the requirement that 30% of overall housing provision should be social housing, with the need for a more flexible approach in view of the high proportion of rented properties in the locality and the potential impact of social housing provision on the commerciality of the scheme.

The requirement for social housing reflects adopted Local Plan policy. The provision of much needed shared equity social housing, which is largely absent from Blackpool will give residents a future stake in the local community. Such provision is considered could form part of quality mixed housing within Talbot Gateway, and with the involvement of a housing association would not undermine deliverability.

However, in response to representations it is recommended that recognition should be included in the Brief that all housing schemes will need to be looked at in their totality, taking into account the local context and site characteristics of the Talbot Gateway, and to make further reference to the alternative of providing off-site social housing.

## **Access/ Transport issues**

Lancashire County Council, ReBlackpool URC, Wilkinsons, Grattan plc, and Blackpool & Fylde Rail Users Association all seek clarification of future requirements on future parking provision – with concerns regarding the lack of clarity about the future of specific car parks. Leisure Parcs particularly emphasizes the need to minimise disruption to existing levels of provision during and as a result of any redevelopment.

The future scale of provision, however, is dependent on the precise mix of uses that come forward, with the key need to ensure sufficient short term parking conveniently located and integrated with the existing town centre. The draft SPD already makes clear that while the existing provision (of 2095 spaces) is fragmented and inefficient, any significant loss of existing short stay provision (around 1200 spaces) should only be progressed in conjunction with proposals for replacement provision.

It is accepted that further clarification regarding short stay/ long stay parking needs is required. Changes are therefore recommended to ensure that around two thirds of the 1,200 short stay spaces are retained within or on the edge of the defined town centre part of the site, and that a minimum of 600 longer stay spaces continue to be provided to meet existing needs. Adequate parking will also be required for all new development within Talbot Gateway in line with Local Plan maximum standards.

In terms of retention or redevelopment of specific existing car parks, there is recognition in the Brief of the need for flexibility, with it being a matter for the preferred developer to come forward with more detailed proposals as part of their overall scheme for the redevelopment of Talbot Gateway. While changes are recommended to the SPD to clarify where the Council would encourage redevelopment and the King Street site has been identified as a preferred location for replacement provision, the SPD requirements are focused on the number of parking spaces to be provided rather than precise locations.

Similar flexibility is sought by ReBlackpool URC regarding the future alignment and distribution of traffic through Talbot Gateway, which can also only be determined in the context of development proposals for the site as a whole. It is accepted that the current reference in the draft SPD to achieving optimum capacity need not therefore relate to such provision being “across the centre of the site” and should be amended to reflect the need for flexibility.

The need to take account of the long term possibility of an extension of the tramway link along Talbot Road is an important consideration referred to in responses from Amec and Lancashire County Council. A number of the representations from a range of interests also emphasised support for improved transport interchange facilities.

### **The Council's Overall Requirements**

The Council and Re-Blackpool, through both the Planning Brief and Re-Blackpool's Development Brief, are seeking substantial environmental, transport, social and economic benefits from the Talbot Gateway development. As discussions have progressed with the three potential development partners, the likelihood of all these requirements being accommodated by the body of viable developments within the site has been questioned. It may therefore be the case that the Council and Re-Blackpool will have to make priority choices between the requirements of the Planning Brief. It is not, however, intended to dilute the brief in response to this possibility. The brief already recognizes that there are a range of core, desirable and other acceptable uses that may not all be accommodated within the site. Nevertheless, it is recommended that a statement that recognizes the foregoing possibility of priority choices having to be made be incorporated.

### **3 RECOMMENDATIONS**

- To approve the proposed changes to the Talbot Gateway SPD in response to representations and other considerations.
- To formally adopt the Talbot Gateway Supplementary Planning Document incorporating these changes as the Council's detailed policy guidance to be applied to the determination of planning application for the redevelopment of the Talbot Gateway.
- To give delegated authority to officers to prepare the final Talbot Gateway SPD incorporating the approved changes and any further minor changes and corrections that do not affect the substance of the detailed policy guidance.

**APPENDIX A**

**TALBOT GATEWAY PLANNING BRIEF**

**CONSIDERATION OF REPRESENTATIONS ON DRAFT BRIEF**

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
001	001	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
General	Steven Broomhead	04-Aug-06	07-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
Northwest Regional Development Agency	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

General
---------

Page no

-
---

Section

-
---

Summary of Your Comment

The Talbot Gateway is a key component of the Blackpool Masterplan. Implementation of the Masterplan is one of the transformational actions within the 2006 Regional Economic Strategy (Action 48). Preparation of the Draft Planning Brief thus marks an important early stage in the delivery of this action. From the Agency's perspective, the Draft Brief clearly sets out the context and objectives for the Talbot Gateway area, and comprehensively covers the range of issues to be addressed as part of any planning applications for development within the area. The Agency therefore welcomes and supports the publication of the Draft Planning Brief.
---

Changes Sought

None
------

Council's Response

Support noted
---------------

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

None
------





Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
002	001	Support	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Phil Smith (Mrs)	17-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Government Office for the North West			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
The draft brief seems to us to be a comprehensive guide to the development of the site, with clear cross-references to relevant policies of the Blackpool Local Plan 2001-2016 and explanation of consultation arrangements.			
Changes Sought			
None			
Council's Response			
Support noted			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
None			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
002	002	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Phil Smith (Mrs)	17-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Government Office for the North West			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 1 - Introduction			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
It would be helpful if the "Timeline for Preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document" contained dates for the various stages.			
Changes Sought			
As above			
Council's Response			
Point accepted			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
The dates of the various stages have been included in the Revised Draft Planning Brief at the end of Paragraph 1.8			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
002	003	Objection

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Phil Smith (Mrs)	17-Aug-06	17-Aug-06

Respondent Agent

Government Office for the North West

Part

Part 6 - Access and Accessibility

Page no

-

Section

Transport Requirements

Summary of Your Comment

We recommend that the word "required" be changed to "sought". Planning obligations (which we presume you are intending to use to secure developer contributions) can seek, but not "require" contributions.

Changes Sought

As above

Council's Response

Point accepted

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

Para 6.48 amended to state may be "sought" instead of "required".

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
002	004	Comment

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Phil Smith (Mrs)	17-Aug-06	17-Aug-06

Respondent Agent

Government Office for the North West

Part

-

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

As regards conformity with RSS, as we said in our response to the Conference Leisure Quarter draft planning brief, this is an issue for the RPB so, if you have not already done so, you should consult the NWRA about this.

Changes Sought

None

Council's Response

The NWRA has been separately consulted on the Draft SPD

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

None

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
003	001	Objections

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
Lancashire County Council	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

General
---------

Page no

-
---

Section

-
---

Summary of Your Comment

There is a lack of an overall "vision" of what will be required for the site. If it is intended that the Masterplan itself will deliver this, it is suggested that this be made explicit in the planning brief.
---

Changes Sought

As above
----------

Council's Response

It is accepted that clarification is required within Section 2 "The Vision for the Future" to make more explicit at the outset that while the SPD provides the detailed planning and design framework, the overall concept masterplan will be provided subsequently by the successful developer.
--

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

Amend "The Vision for the Future" (para 2.6) to

2.6A Through the Talbot Gateway development, Blackpool Council is seeking to transform one of Blackpool's most decayed, unsightly and under utilised urban quarters into a prestige gateway and arrival point. Complementary retail, civic, commercial and residential developments are intended to greatly enhance the vitality of the town centre and the resort. Distinctive, high quality buildings and streets will enrich the visitor experience and be a catalyst for Blackpool's Regeneration.

2.6B By 2020, it is anticipated that Talbot Gateway will provide a stimulating arrival experience that provides an exciting new northern anchor for the Town Centre. It will be a cosmopolitan area of mixed uses that provides seamless integration with the Centre. Major redevelopment that includes a new public transportation interchange around a re-modelled station, new Council offices, new courts and public space will have created a civic focus for Blackpool and Fylde residents. It will be a major contributor to the town centre economy, adding to its vitality and providing quality jobs and homes for local people.

2.6 The Council's regeneration vision for the site will be an important component in developing a clear design philosophy for a distinctively identifiable new principal gateway for town centre users arriving from the north and east and visitors arriving at Blackpool North Railway Station. The SPD (Sections 5 – 7) provides a detailed expansion of the planning and design principles for the development of the site and sets out the core components and other supporting uses which will potentially comprise the overall redevelopment of the Talbot Gateway.

2.6C The extent to which the range of uses can subsequently be accommodated within Talbot Gateway will be determined by the successful developer partner who will prepare an agreed overall concept masterplan to be progressed by a phased programme of redevelopment. The detail set out in this section is to illustrate the central characteristics and themes of the Council's wider vision for the regeneration of the town centre and resort core area.

Respondent No                      Comment No                      Type

003                                      002                                      Objection

Policy                                      Name                                      Date sent                      Date rec'd

-                                      Mark Sims                                      11-Aug-06                      14-Aug-06

Respondent                                      Agent

Lancashire County Council                                     

Part

General

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

It would be useful to have a context map at the start of the document as well as diagrams in the text that show the main accessibility links to/from the town centre and seafront (existing and proposed). Plan 10 should be expanded, e.g. to show key links to residential areas and the National Cycle Route 62.

Changes Sought

As above.

Council's Response

Amend Plan 10.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

Extend annotations on Plan 10 to seafront and from other neighbouring residential areas.

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
003	003	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
Lancashire County Council	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

General
---------

Page no

-
---

Section

-
---

Summary of Your Comment

The intention to provide a greatly enhanced "gateway" to Blackpool and to create an effective transport interchange with improved access to the seafront is supported.
--

Changes Sought

None
------

Council's Response

Support noted
---------------

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

None
------



Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	005	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
In respect of the Sub Regional Policy, reference should be made to Joint Lancashire Structure Plan (JLSP) Policies 1, 7, 9, 10, 16, 17, 18, "Parking Standards" and SPG "Access and Parking".			
Changes Sought			
As above.			
Council's Response			
It is not considered necessary to refer in detail to the individual policies in the JLSP. The policies in the Local Plan referred to in the SPD are in accordance with the JLSP policies and spell out in more detail the relevant strategic planning policy requirements. General reference to the JLSP requirements can appropriately be expanded and included in the "Summary of Strategic Policy Framework (para 4.11).			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
Para 4.11 (3) to be amended to state: Lancashire Structure Plan 2001-2016. The JLSP identifies Blackpool as one of four Tier 1 centres in Lancashire, with Blackpool town centre as a focus for retail, entertainment and leisure; major office development; and transportation improvements. The more detailed policies in the Blackpool Local Plan accord with policies in the JLSP.			Joint

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	006	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 8 - The Approvals Process			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Retail Impact Assessment			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>The approach to the Retail Impact Assessment is in principle supported. Notwithstanding this, the approach proposed does not however fully reflect JLSP Policy 16. As proposed in the Draft Planning Brief, the approach exclusively refers to the vitality and viability of centres within Blackpool's administrative area and does not have regard to other centres. JLSP Policy 16 refers to "...the vitality and viability of any town centres, district centres, local centres or the overall shopping and leisure provision in small towns and rural areas within or adjoining Lancashire". It is recommended that the text be amended to reflect this.</p>			
Changes Sought			
As above.			
Council's Response			
<p>It is accepted the approach set out for the retail impact assessment should reflect that in JLSP Policy 16. However, Blackpool town centre is identified as a Tier 1 location, where development should be focused, with Talbot Gateway within and on the edge of the centre. In this context it is considered unnecessary to quote the JLSP wording in full, but minor amendment can be appropriately made to ensure fuller consistency and that there is no conflict.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
<p>Amend Part 8 "retail Impact Assessment" (3rd para) to state: <span style="float: right;">The Council</span>  will need to be satisfied that any retail proposals as part of the mixed redevelopment of the site will not  undermine the vitality and viability of Blackpool Town Centre or other district and local centres within  Blackpool, or any other nearby town centre, but will complement and provide additionality to the retail offer.</p>			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	007	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 9 - The Approvals Process			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
In addition to a Retail Impact Assessment being required it is recommended that an assessment of the need for new office floorspace is required in accordance with PPS6.			
Changes Sought			
As above.			
Council's Response			
<p>The PPS6 requirement for an assessment of need relates to DPD rather than SPD preparation. That said, a substantial element of any requirement for office floorspace is envisaged will be for the relocation of Council office accommodation. The potential requirements for council office accommodation in TG has been assessed and is set out in Section 5 of the SPD.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">It is also accepted</p> <p>that to the extent that any commercial office provision is proposed, it ought to be supported by an office assessment which justifies the quantum and range of space proposed to be provided.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
<p>Add new sub-section on "Office Assessment" to Part 8 "The Approvals Process" to state:</p> <p>Office Assessment</p> <p>The potential for council and other public office space has been considered in the Draft SPD. Proposals for commercial office accommodation should be supported by an assessment which justifies the quantum and range of space.</p>			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	008	Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Lancashire County Council	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 6 - Access and Accessibility		
Page no	-		
Section	Car Parking		
Summary of Your Comment	This should reflect the guidance in JLSP Policy 7 and paragraph 3.21 of "Access and Parking".		
Changes Sought			
Council's Response	<p>JLSP Policy 7 is adequately reflected in the brief, which pays close attention to parking issues and their potential impact upon the resort. The brief – para 6.16 - states:</p> <p>Para 6.16: New uses within the development should be provided with adequate parking in line with Local Plan maximum parking standards (Policy AS1/Appendix B), ideally to account for the high accessibility of the location and the impact of positive Travel Plan measures in future.</p> <p>Nevertheless, it is agreed that further clarification on long stay parking and the emphasis on short stay parking should be included in the brief. The total provision of public parking within the Talbot Gateway site is therefore anticipated to be reduced from 2,095 to 1,800 in accordance with the following change to the brief:</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>6.11A The future scale of provision is dependent on the precise mix of uses that come forward, with the key need to ensure sufficient short term parking conveniently located and integrated with the existing town centre. In total, 1,200 short stay public spaces therefore require to be retained/redeveloped within the Talbot Gateway site. Of these, approximately two thirds are required to be provided within the defined town centre part of the site. In addition, a minimum of 600 longer stay spaces require to be provided within the Talbot Gateway site to meet existing needs.</p> <p>6.11B In addition to the foregoing, adequate parking will be required for all new development within Talbot Gateway in line with Local Plan maximum standards (see para 6.16). Within these terms, the integration of different users parking provision is encouraged by the Council. Where this is achievable, the potential for the shared provision and resultant reduction in the overall number of spaces should also be considered.</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	009	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Car Parking			
Summary of Your Comment			
It is unclear (e.g. paragraphs 5.14 and 6.10/6.12) about what the proposals are for the total number of spaces and what should be short-stay and long-stay. The overall impression is one of about the same level but this has not been made explicit.			
Changes Sought			
Explicit reference needed.			
Council's Response			
See response 003/008			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
See change 003/008			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
003	010	Objection

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06

Respondent Agent

Lancashire County Council

Part

Part 6 - Access and Accessibility

Page no

-

Section

Car Parking

Summary of Your Comment

JLSP Policy 7 and SPG support long-stay tourist visitor parking but seek to reduce commuter parking. The document is considered to be vague on parking regimes.

Changes Sought

More clarity needed.

Council's Response

See response to comment 003/008.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	011	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Car Parking			
Summary of Your Comment			
It is noted that there is no indication given to parking provision for motorbikes. This should be revised so as to reflect adopted JLSP "Parking Standards".			
Changes Sought			
As above.			
Council's Response			
The brief will be revised to include reference to motorcycle parking in line with JLSP parking standards.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
Amend Sub-heading after para 6.9 to refer to Parking instead of "Car Parking". Amend para 6.16 to refer to adequate car, "motorbyke and cycle" parking in line with Local Plan maximum parking standards.			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	012	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Car Parking			
Summary of Your Comment			
My understanding is that the Talbot Road Car Park is to be removed, although this is not very clear. Clarification is sought in this respect and it is recommended that the text be amended to reflect this.			
Changes Sought			
As above.			
Council's Response			
The position regarding the future of the Talbot Road Car park and car parking provision is set out at paras 6.10-6.17 of the Draft SPD. There is no final decision as yet made whether the existing building is to be redeveloped. Its potential replacement with more modern and attractive parking is anticipated, but will be a matter for detailed future consideration by the selected developer. Development proposals will need to show how the Talbot Car park is to be replaced. Alternatively, proposals for its retention would similarly need to be justified. The Draft SPD accurately sets out the current position.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
None			



Respondent No	Comment No	Type
003	014	Objection

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06

Respondent Agent

Lancashire County Council

Part

Part 6 - Access and Accessibility

Page no

-

Section

Car Parking

Summary of Your Comment

Commuter parking should be limited and reduced in line with Travel Plans and JLSP Policy 7.

Changes Sought

As above.

Council's Response

See responses to comments 003/008.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
003	015	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
Lancashire County Council	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

Part 6 - Access and Accessibility

Page no

-

Section

Public Transport

Summary of Your Comment

The provision of a high quality rail/bus/coach transport interchange is essential - not just for Blackpool, but also for residents of Lancashire. The proposed transport interchange would be used by residents of Lancashire not only as a destination to Blackpool, but also for through-journeys within Lancashire. This applies particularly to residents in Wyre and Fylde districts. (Journey example: Cleveleys or Staining - bus to Blackpool, then train, bus or coach to Preston, Manchester and beyond). With reference to design of transport interchange, Andy Whitlam (Public Transport Policy) would be quite happy to be involved in discussions at an appropriate stage with officers of your Council - based on his experienced gained on interchanges in the County Council.

Changes Sought

None

Council's Response

The brief identifies public transport interchange as a key objective defining this as follows:

Para 6.3: Improved public transport access and connectivity to, and across and within the site, including enhanced public transport interchange facilities for rail, coach, bus and taxi and the improved integration of Blackpool North Station with the Town Centre.

There is no requirement for design support from Lancashire County Council at this time.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	016	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Public Transport			
Summary of Your Comment			
It is not clear if Talbot Road is to be the main destination for seasonal coach parking.			
Changes Sought			
Clarification.			
Council's Response			
<p>The location of the main destination for seasonal coach services will depend upon the proposals brought forward by developers. It is a clearly stated aspiration that coach arrival quality and accessibility will be achieved within this development:</p> <p>Para 6.3: A new coach terminus facility could potentially be located within easy reach of the existing set of passenger facilities at the railway station (shops, taxi ranks etc) to avoid duplication of provision. Otherwise, it would be expected to offer, shelter, seating, toilets, taxi ranking and passenger information on site, together with limited retailing if possible.</p> <p>The location of coach services cannot be further defined at this time.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			



Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	018	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Public Transport			
Summary of Your Comment			
Information is lacking as to how the bus/rail interchange is to be achieved physically and with respect to information, etc. No real impression of the quality and nature of stops is given. For example, is there to be a "mini-interchange"?			
Changes Sought			
Clarification.			
Council's Response			
Provision of interchange facilities will depend upon proposals brought forward by developers and cannot be more clearly defined at this point. Those facilities provided will be in line with the Council's current Quality Bus Corridor programme and emerging bus strategy and refined in partnership with bus operators and user groups as proposals are brought forward.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
003	019	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
Lancashire County Council	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

Part 6 - Access and Accessibility
-----------------------------------

Page no

-
---

Section

Public Transport
------------------

Summary of Your Comment

Safeguarding the future tram link into the site is supported.
---

Changes Sought

None.
-------

Council's Response

Support noted
---------------

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

None
------

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	020	Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Public Transport			
Summary of Your Comment			
Although the aspirations to bring the tramway/light rail are long term, it is considered essential that design allows for such a proposal.			
Changes Sought			
None			
Council's Response			
Para 6.37 currently states that "it will be vital to retain the capability to accommodate a tram interchange in the future". For clarification the need to retain the potential for a tramway extension into the site could appropriately also be added to the list of key objectives at the start of Part 6 on Access and Accessibility.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
Amend 6th bullet of para 6.3 to state: Improved public transport access and connectivity to, across and within the site, including enhanced public transport interchange facilities for rail, coach, bus and taxi; the improved integration of Blackpool North Station with the Town Centre; and a retained potential within any scheme for a longer term extension of the tramway into the site.			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	021	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Cycling			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>It is noted that no specific on road improvements are identified. It is recommended that cycle links from the station to Route 62 and the seafront should be key elements of the design. Cycle routes to/from residential areas should be emphasised. In addition to the above, reference should be made to cycle parking on development sites.</p>			
Changes Sought			
As above.			
Council's Response			
<p>The comment is felt to be covered adequately in the brief, which includes references to cycle routes and parking within the development.</p> <p>A link to the seafront is outside the brief's scope and the development's geographical area. The brief cites on-highway solutions for cyclists and this may be the best way of addressing this issue within the development process.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
003	022	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06

Respondent Agent

Lancashire County Council

Part

Part 6 - Access and Accessibility

Page no

-

Section

Transport Requirements

Summary of Your Comment

This paragraph encourages the use of conditions and legal agreements. This is supported.

Changes Sought

None.

Council's Response

Noted

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

None

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	023	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Transport Requirements			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>You will be aware that a revised Lancashire Policy Paper was reported to LPOS in June. It is hoped that each authority will consider how to formally integrate the document into their LDF process reflecting local circumstances. It is therefore recommended that the Policy Paper be referred to in the Planning Brief, and be actively linked to it.</p>			
Changes Sought			
As above.			
Council's Response			
<p>Whereas the Lancashire Policy Paper has been considered at officer level and will further inform the development of the approach to Planning Obligations, it has not currently been formally adopted by the Council. As such it is not considered appropriate to make direct reference to the Paper in the draft SPD.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
<p>No change in direct response to this representation, but reference in "The Use of Conditions and Legal Agreements" at the end of Part 8 of the Draft SPD to be amended to correctly refer to Policy PO1 not Policy PO4 of the Local Plan.</p>			

Respondent No                      Comment No                      Type

003                                      024                                      Objection

Policy                                      Name                                      Date sent                      Date rec'd

-                                      Mark Sims                                      11-Aug-06                      14-Aug-06

Respondent                                      Agent

Lancashire County Council                                     

Part

Part 6 - Access and Accessibility

Page no

-

Section

Transport Requirements

Summary of Your Comment

The list of possible planning obligations and conditions does not make explicit what topics will be covered by which and how they will be arrived at.

Changes Sought

Clarification.

Council's Response

It will only be possible to determine the full range of purposes for which planning conditions and legal agreements will be sought when more detailed proposals come forward for the Talbot Gateway. In advance of this, the SPD provides appropriate guidance giving examples of the range of purposes which the Council anticipates the use of planning permissions and legal agreements. What purposes are covered by which is not relevant at this stage, and will also be dependent on precisely what more detailed proposals come forward, and the phasing/ type of future planning applications.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change



Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
003	026	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lancashire County Council			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 8 - The Approvals Process			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Archaeological Assessment			
Summary of Your Comment			
Lancashire County Archaeology Service (LCAS) has already indicated the need for further assessment of the proposal site as a whole, as stated in paras 3.51-3.53 of the brief, but would argue that the merit of the Talbot Road Car Park as a building of special interest has already been established within para 7.26.			
Changes Sought			
Recognition of merit.			
Council's Response			
The original building may have had some architectural merit as set out at para 7.26 , but this has been severely compromised by subsequent alteration. In these terms it is considered the Draft SPD accurately details the current situation. An archaeological assessment of the entire Talbot Gateway site (paras 3.51 - 3.53) is a requirement as part of any development scheme.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
003	027	Comment

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mark Sims	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06

Respondent Agent

Lancashire County Council

Part

General

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

LCAS is of the opinion that the Talbot Road Car Park and Bus Station; on the basis of its being the first of its type, the method of its construction and the style of its decoration; are worthy of consideration for listing. LCAS has therefore passed on the information supplied by ICE to English Heritage's Listing Section. It is important that the status of this building be determined as soon as possible. Even as an unlisted building it is likely that LCAS would wish to see the building retained within any proposed development in a significantly unaltered form.

Changes Sought

None.

Council's Response

Blackpool Council does not regard the Talbot Road Car Park as being of merit for listing and would not support any proposal to list. Indeed, whilst no firm decision has yet been taken, the Council anticipates the redevelopment of this building.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

None as a result of the consultation. However, the following paragraphs are amended under the sub heading: "Buildings and Areas where Re-development is Encouraged"

Talbot

Road Bus Station/Car Park and Prudential House

The Talbot Road Car Park was the country's first true multi-storey car park when completed in 1939. Its current external appearance and internal layout is of an unattractive building with outdated facilities, especially at ground floor level. This, however, disguises the original late deco fabric of the building which is of architectural merit. The building includes a series of decorative relief panels depicting forms of motor transport similar to those on the Council's Municipal Buildings. Whatever the future of the structure as a whole, the potential contribution of these features to the eventual development scheme will require to be considered.

Developers will also be encouraged to liaise with the owners/tenants of the Prudential House block to seek to secure a development that complements any redevelopment proposals for the Bus Station/Multi Storey.

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
004	001	Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Ian Southworth	16-Aug-06	21-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Environment Agency			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 7 - Design Parameters and Principles			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Energy and Resource Conservation			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>It is noted that no mention is made of drainage from the area. As we stated in our comments on the Scoping report, we are promoting the use of SuDS on developments, as they provide not only a measure of attenuating the rate of surface water discharged to the system but help improve the quality of the water. It can also offer other benefits in terms of promoting groundwater recharge and amenity enhancements. This approach involves using a range of techniques including soakaways, infiltration trenches, permeable pavements, grassed swales, ponds and wetlands. Approved Document Part H of the Building Regulations 2000 sets out a hierarchy for surface water disposal which encourages a SuDS approach. Any SuDS should be carried out in accordance with the latest Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems as specified in Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems - Best Practice (CIRIA Report C523) and Sustainable Drainage Systems, Hydraulic, Structural and Water Quality Advice (CIRIA Report C609), Appendix E, in Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems Design Manual for England and Wales (CIRIA Report C522), and the Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems. The Interim Code of Practice provides advice on design, adoption and maintenance issues and a full overview of other technical guidance on SuDS. The Interim Code of Practice is available on the Environment Agency website.</p>			
Changes Sought			
Encourage use of SuDS through the brief.			
Council's Response			
Reference to the need for the consideration of SuDS potential is made in para. 7.70. It is considered that an additional reference to the Environment Agency's Interim Code of Practice is appropriate.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
Para 7.70 Add new sentence after last sentence; " The Environment Agency's Interim Code of Practice for Sustainable Drainage Systems provides technical advice on design, adoption and maintenance of SuDS."			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
005	001	Comment ? Support	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	John Holt	03-Aug-06	03-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Blackpool Town Centre BID			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>There is some concern over the extent of retail development to be included in the proposals and that its type and extent may detract from the offer of the rest of the town centre, having regard to how the centre of gravity of the town centre has shifted over the years to the south. In parallel with this, a concern was expressed that a vacuum would not be created between the new development and that associated with the Hounds Hill and it was very much hoped that the area between these two developments would attract and realise sufficient retail offer to make the whole Town Centre offer a homogenous one.</p>			
Changes Sought			
None.			
Council's Response			
<p>The first of six stated main functions of the Brief set out at para 2.5 is to secure comprehensive phased redevelopment proposals that will ... "greatly strengthen and integrate with the adjoining town centre"</p> <p>Reference is then set out in Section 5 (paras 5.35 - 5.38) of the Draft SPD that reflects these concerns and seeks to limit the scale and location of non-food retail development at Talbot Gateway.</p> <p>Policy SR3 specifically states that any non-food stores would be expected to locate within that part of the site within the defined town centre (i.e. west of Cookson Street) which already effectively forms an integral part of the existing town centre shopping. The SPD similarly sets out that any further development outside the defined town centre will only be allowed if there is a need for such floorspace and no suitable sites available in the town centre. Express reference is made to the existing allocated sites available in the town centre at Houndshill and the Winter Gardens, and to the view that these developments and the TG development should also act as a wider catalyst for further expansion of other existing sites within the defined town centre.</p> <p>These requirements therefore already reflect the concerns set out in the representation to ensure that the type, extent and location of retail development at Talbot Gateway does not detract from the rest of the town centre offer.</p> <p>A Heritage Lottery supported Townscape Heritage Initiative is operating within the town centre conservation area with the specific aim of raising the quality of the town centre core trading potential through the restoration of period built form.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
For further clarification, add sentence at end of para 5.38 to state:			"The
<p>overall aim in retail terms is that any permitted development at Talbot Gateway will need to form an integral part of a strengthened and homogenous Blackpool town centre retail offer.</p>			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	001	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
ReBlackpool			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 2 - Background			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>The need to raise standards and expectations in design is a fundamental requirement of all development proposals being pursued in Blackpool. The Board agrees with the sentiment that the Talbot Gateway should develop its own distinctive theme within the Blackpool brand but is concerned that the assertion in para 2.5 (iv) that proposals for the site achieve urban design and architecture of "exceptional" standard is inappropriate and unrealistic.</p>			
Changes Sought			
<p>The Board would suggest that, given the ambition, mix and type of uses envisaged, the brief ought to emphasise the aspiration for high quality architecture that avoids a mundane or formulaic approach and is consistent with the guiding principles contained in the rest of the brief.</p>			
Council's Response			
<p>The importance of Talbot Road as a resort gateway demands a high quality of arrival experience, physically and visually. It will be important that the combination of uses, especially the civic buildings, are conceived to create an order and sense of place for Talbot Gateway as being distinctive as Blackpool, but distinct from other character areas within the town.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No                      Comment No                      Type

006                                      002                                      Objection

Policy                                      Name                                      Date sent                      Date rec'd

-                                      Reg Haslam                                      18-Aug-06                      23-Aug-06

Respondent                                      Agent

ReBlackpool                                     

Part

Part 3 - The Talbot Gateway

Page no

-

Section

Ground Conditions and Drainage

Summary of Your Comment

The study commissioned by ReBlackpool sought basic ground information and should not be relied on to inform development proposals.

Changes Sought

The Board suggest that it is important to state that any data held by the Council or ReBlackpool would not remove the requirement for prospective developers to carry out their own checks.

Council's Response

Point accepted

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

Add sentence to end of para 3.54 to state:                      "The availability of any data held by the Council or ReBlackpool does not remove the requirement for developers who must be responsible for their own detailed assessment of ground conditions".

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	003	Support/Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
ReBlackpool	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	A Comprehensive Approach		
Summary of Your Comment	The Board welcomes the statement that individual developments will only be considered in the context of a comprehensive approach.		
Changes Sought	The Board believes that it would be prudent and helpful to clarify and strengthen this statement by referring, perhaps, to 'robust, comprehensive plans for the wider Gateway site' and adding further justification for the comprehensive approach.		
Council's Response	Point accepted		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	Amend para 5.2 to state: "Proposals must be presented in the context of a comprehensive approach that demonstrates a willingness to collaborate with the Council and other major landowners to pursue robust, comprehensive plans for the wider Gateway site through the planning, land assembly and construction phases. This approach will need to be encapsulated within an overall concept masterplan that will be the basis of future planning applications for the entire site".		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	004	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
ReBlackpool	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	A Comprehensive Approach		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>There is reference here to collaboration between developers, which could be interpreted to suggest that the phased development of the entire Gateway by a single developer is unlikely or undesirable. ReBlackpool is, in fact, seeking to secure a developer that will take a long-term view and commit to comprehensive development of the entire gateway site.</p>		
Changes Sought	Clarification		
Council's Response	Point accepted and reference to developers and development partners to be clarified/ deleted.		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>Amend para 5.2 to state:          "Proposals must be presented in the context of a comprehensive approach that demonstrates a willingness to collaborate with the Council and other major landowners to pursue robust, comprehensive plans for the wider Gateway site through the planning, land assembly and construction phases. This approach will need to be encapsulated within an overall concept masterplan that will be the basis of future planning applications for the entire site".</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
006	005	Objectin

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
ReBlackpool	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part
Part 5 - Development Character

Page no
-

Section
A Comprehensive Approach

#### Summary of Your Comment

The Board believes that there is a need for a pragmatic approach to social housing and would ask that the statements referring to this matter in Para 5.31 are reviewed in the light of; the large stock of rented accommodation and lower cost housing in inner Blackpool and on the edge of the Talbot Gateway, the need to widen housing market interest in inner Blackpool and induce a more balanced social structure, and crucially, the need to create economic conditions that will give the market a genuine opportunity to fund the expensive, transformational change that is desired. The Planning Brief asks for marked improvements in buildings quality, the pedestrian environment, and transport infrastructure and contains a shopping list that extends from social housing at 30% of proposed new housing to off-site highway improvements. There is a danger that housing will either be omitted entirely because of the social housing burden on commerciality, or included, but without generating the positive returns needed to fund high quality, transformational change.

#### Changes Sought

The Board believes that it would be helpful for the brief to acknowledge the economic situation prevailing in Blackpool and the difficult challenge the brief sets for prospective developers by stating that the Council will look at schemes in their totality, apply the guidelines flexibly and judge applications on the basis of the overall benefit. This is particularly important where there is a wish to encourage creative solutions, it may be extremely beneficial to relocate existing uses within the site, and there is a wish to see vibrant, animated streets traversing the site and a mix of retail, café and office service uses at street level. Clearly prospective developers will need to be advised that flexible interpretation of guidelines can only be contemplated where there is a convincing overall scheme, supported by robust justifications.

#### Council's Response

The requirement in para 5.31 replicates the approach in Policy HN8 of the recently adopted Blackpool Local Plan. Overriding reasons would be needed to justify any exception to such provision.

The 30% affordable housing requirement reflects the need for a mix of housing to meet a range of needs and specifically does have regard to the already large stock of rented accommodation and lower cost housing. The requirement is for the affordable housing to be provided either as discounted low cost homes for sale or shared ownership social housing – and as such is specifically aimed at ensuring any such provision at Talbot Gateway will provide a new (largely absent in Blackpool) type of affordable housing to meet local needs. This provision would enable residents to take a first step towards home ownership and have a real stake in the community.

There is no reason apparent why such provision cannot be made in TG as part of an improved higher quality mix of housing. With the involvement of a housing association to support the subsidised element of any provision, commercial viability should also not be undermined and may be supported by a shared approach.

As an alternative, the Local Plan provides for contributions for off-site provision of social housing in lieu of provision on site directly linked to housing renewal action in Blackpool's priority neighbourhoods. Exceptionally, it is also accepted it may be inappropriate to include quality affordable housing provision in all schemes, and the Council will look at all proposed housing provision in its totality in the application of policy and judge applications on their overall merits. For example, if new landmark high quality housing was to be provided catering entirely for a different market than is currently provided for in Blackpool town centre, it may not be expected that affordable housing provision should be included in such a

scheme.

Given the opportunities provided by the 12.8 hectare TG site as a whole, the expectation in making a range of quality provision in the site as a whole is that the inclusion of quality affordable housing is considered entirely appropriate in seeking to deliver regeneration and providing an adequate mix of house types taking into account the local context and site characteristics of the Talbot Gateway.

**Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief**

Amend para 5.31 to state:

Any

residential development will be required to provide a good housing mix to meet a wider range of housing needs in accordance with Policies HN6, HN7 and HN8 of the Local Plan including increased numbers of housing units with 2 or more bedrooms. Policy HN8 sets out that a total of 30% of provision would be required to be as social housing which, in the context of the current housing in the immediate locality should either be as discounted homes to buy or shared ownership social housing, with the alternative of providing off-site provision of social housing. All housing schemes will be looked at in their totality, applying the policies and judging applications on the basis of their overall merits.

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
006	006	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
ReBlackpool	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

Part 5 - Development Character

Page no

-

Section

A Major Foodstore

Summary of Your Comment

The Board recognises and supports the necessity of the provision of a food store in the development and also supports the need to control the type of goods available for sale within the food store in order to avoid impact on the Town Centre.

Changes Sought

None

Council's Response

Support noted

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

None

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	007	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
ReBlackpool	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	Replacement Sports and Recreation Facility		
Summary of Your Comment	The Board suggests that this section can be updated in light of recent decisions taken by the Council with regard to the Bowls Hall		
Changes Sought	Update brief.		
Council's Response	Point accepted. The future of the Indoor Bowls Club was considered by Blackpool Council Executive on 28th June 2006 when it was determined no replacement provision was required to be made in the TG redevelopment scheme.		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>Para 5.41 to be amended to state:</p> <p>In accordance with Policy SR3, the Council has undertaken a detailed assessment of the useage of the existing bowls facility which has been is shown to be surplus to requirements, and will not need to be replaced within the redevelopment area (indoor bowls will subsequently be taken into account when considering multi-purpose indoor leisure provision in the North Shore area).</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
006	009	Support/Comment

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
ReBlackpool	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

Part 6 - Access and Accessibility

Page no

-

Section

Transport Requirements

Summary of Your Comment

Well conceived access by a wide range of means into and through the site is a vital component of successful scheme development. The Board recognises this and supports the key objectives outlined in this section of the brief. Balancing pedestrian and vehicular priorities will be a major challenge for the successful implementation of the scheme, together with ensuring the provision of sufficient suitably located parking spaces and appropriate public transport facilities.

Changes Sought

None.

Council's Response

Support noted

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	010	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
ReBlackpool	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 6 - Access and Accessibility		
Page no	-		
Section	Transport Requirements		
Summary of Your Comment	Paragraph 6.7 indicates that "the primary requirement is to achieve optimum capacity for the Town Centre Distributor Route (TCDR) across the centre of the site". In the context of the other transport priorities for site development it is unhelpful to describe the TCDR as the primary requirement.		
Changes Sought	The Board suggests that this reference could be altered through substitution of "the primary" with "an important" and to remove reference to "the centre of the site" given that highway proposals can only come forward with development proposals for the site as a whole and through the iterative process with the developer.		
Council's Response	Agreed		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>Para 6.7 of the Brief to be amended to state:</p> <p>'A key requirement is to achieve optimum capacity for the north-south Town Centre Distributor Road (TCDR) across the site between George Street/Cookson Street and Springfield Road/Dickson Road.'</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	011	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
ReBlackpool			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Coach			
Summary of Your Comment			
The Board suggests that this section can be updated in light of recent discussions between ReBlackpool, the Council and National Express.			
Changes Sought			
As above.			
Council's Response			
The brief continues to reflect the Access and Accessibility issues pertaining to the site and it is not necessary to amend it significantly in the context of the discussions that are mentioned.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	012	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
ReBlackpool	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 7 - Design Parameters and Principles		
Page no	-		
Section	General		
Summary of Your Comment	The Board did not find clear direction for prospective developers in this important part of the Brief. There is a great deal of repetition and it is, perhaps, too long and pitched at an overly high level.		
Changes Sought	Potential redraft?		
Council's Response	The guidance is pitched at a level that the Council expects consideration to be made given the importance of the site to the identity and character of the resort. The guidance is consistent with best practice in establishing design principles and objectives that set the broad contextual framework for the site and be most likely to stimulate a creative and responsive design approach. The consideration of principles and objectives across a range of scales inevitably leads to a degree of overlap. This emphasises the need for a holistic approach to design across the site from the macro to the micro level.		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	No change		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
---------------	------------	------

006	013	Objection
-----	-----	-----------

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
ReBlackpool	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

Part 7 - Design Parameters and Principles
---

Page no

-
---

Section

General
---------

Summary of Your Comment

The guidance on design approach and philosophy is common to the Gateway and the Conference Leisure Quarter. This surprised the Board. The Gateway will fulfil a domestic, civic, cultural and town centre function and should in the Board's view exhibit a personality appropriate to this function and distinctly different from that present in seafront development.
--

Changes Sought

The Board expected to see bespoke guidance that would give prospective developers the necessary direction.
--

Council's Response

The general design approach will be the same even though the local context differs. As a primary gateway to the UK's premier holiday resort it is essential that the resort brand immediately confronts the visitor on arrival and needs to demonstrate a microcosm of the of the resort as a whole, particularly regarding the public realm as well as a particular character in its own right. Designs that would lead to a form of townscape characteristic of a conventional urban centre will therefore be inappropriate within this context.
--

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No Change
-----------

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
---------------	------------	------

006	014	Objection
-----	-----	-----------

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
--------	------	-----------	------------

-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
---	------------	-----------	-----------

Respondent	Agent
------------	-------

ReBlackpool	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------	--------------------------

Part

Part 7 - Design Parameters and Principles

Page no

-

Section

General

Summary of Your Comment

The Board also expected to see direct links between the earlier parts of the brief, which define potential land uses and other key functional requirements, and the guidance on scale, form and appearance of buildings. These links are not present and as a consequence there are no unequivocal statements describing the approach prospective developers will be expected to adopt in determining the disposition, form and appearance of the potentially large building blocks that will contain food and non-food retailing and office uses.

Changes Sought

It would be helpful to include statements which stress that the Council does not wish to see a typical approach to big box food and non-food store design; that there is an expectation that the food store will be developed on more than one level, will be upholstered with other uses to cloak the black box nature of the operation, and will integrate with the other building blocks and existing streets and buildings to create a townscape appropriate to this urban, edge of centre location.

Council's Response

The guidance contained in sections 7.51 to 7.59 provides an overarching set of criteria to inform the design process. At this stage in the design process it is the character of relationships as principles that are important in seeking a creative and responsive approach. Part 5 on Development Character sets out the range of appropriate uses for the Gateway. Part 6 identifies the accessibility requirements with Part 7 describes the design principles and objectives to be applied in expressing these as a seamless extension of the town centre into Talbot Gateway. It is for the developer's design team to respond to this framework in terms of disposition, setting and use arrangement in light of the guidance and commercial imperatives.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

Insert new sentence at the end of para. 7.12. Redevelopment of the Talbot Gateway will need to be designed to read as an extension to the town centre and not as a distinct area adjacent to the town centre and severed by highway edge.

Para 7.43 Add new sentence at the end to read. Architecture will need to be of a high quality and visually appropriate to its use. Mundane or formulaic approaches to building design will not be permitted.

Insert new sentence to start para 7.54 to read. "A number of potential uses will require large floorplates. It will be important that the non-active elevations of these uses are upholstered with other uses of a scale that will enable a rich and active character to be created to the surrounding route network that will integrate with other blocks, buildings and public realm that will create t

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	015	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
ReBlackpool			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 7 - Design Parameters and Principles			
Page no			
-			
Section			
General			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>The aspiration relating to transformational change and the redevelopment of open surface car parking and unsightly buildings is expressed forcibly in the Local Plan but is not carried through to the Planning Brief. Section 7 does not discuss the Council's position on clearance and does not give guidance on the circumstances where this will be supported and the design and layout justifications the Council will expect to receive along with aggressive development proposals. It does seek to identify existing buildings which have townscape value and are deemed to be worthy of retention. Here the brief takes a more precautionary approach than the Local Plan and gives mixed messages, particularly with regard to the Talbot Road multi-storey car park. It also gives a status to the group of buildings at the junction of Dickson Road and Queen Street (para 7.23), which, in the view of the Board, is undeserved. (photographs are attached to the response).</p>			
Changes Sought			
See above.			
Council's Response			
<p>Part 7 informs the process of design and provides substantial guidance on design and layout considerations for master planning proposals which will build on this framework. Nevertheless, it is accepted that guidance should be provided on the areas that the Council would encourage for redevelopment and this is incorporated below. This section includes the Talbot Street multi-storey in accordance with the Local Plan text. The reference to the Dickson Road group adjacent to Funny Girls has been deleted. However, the Council would expect that any redevelopment proposals for this block would complement the adjacent listed building and be of a demonstrably superior quality to what would be replaced.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
<p>7.19 The road scale and configuration is a dominant and defining characteristic creating severance in terms of legible and permeable pedestrian movement into and around the area. The form of development blocks reinforces this through largely inactive frontages and monolithic forms. The characteristics of the key areas are set out below. It is therefore anticipated that much of the Talbot Gateway will be re-developed, although there are certain key buildings that should be retained. These are set out below:</p> <p>Buildings and Areas where Re-development is Encouraged</p> <p>Blackpool North Railway Station</p> <p>Blackpool North, in its current truncated, 'sunken' form, either disgorges passengers onto a busy one-way system with little to announce a sense of arrival at the resort or even of a sense of place, or into a subway access to the town centre via the rear of the Wilkinson's building, compounding the unwelcoming character of the arrival experience. The improvement of access to Blackpool North Station in the context of the wider redevelopment of the area represents an important component in the re-connection of this key transport facility with the resort and town centre. It is considered that this will be best achieved through a complete re-modelling of the Station through a redevelopment that creates a new transport interchange allied to a mixture of commercial, civic and/or residential uses. Subject to the assessment of strategic</p>			

views and the relationship with surrounding buildings, there is an opportunity to create a cluster of high buildings to accommodate these uses within this locale.

#### Area Bounded by Cookson Street, George Street, Buchanan Street and Talbot Road

This area is in the process of being cleared of buildings. It is anticipated that it will form an early phase of the overall Talbot Gateway development.

#### Cookson Street

The Cookson Street area represents some of the most intense urban block forms within the town centre, which are of particular townscape and architectural interest. The area displays a degree of dilapidation through a lack of investment. This is reflected in the retention of many original features, but also in the character of some of the more marginal uses that now characterise the area.

Careful consideration will be needed in the redevelopment of this area so that the townscape form, rhythm and active frontage character of the prevailing streetscene is maintained within any redevelopment to maintain the general scale and balance of the streetscene.

#### Apollo 2000

The Council would encourage developers to liaise with the owners of the Apollo 2000 site to seek to secure a development that helps to integrate the Town Centre, the Talbot Gateway and the residential areas to the east with a high quality built form.

#### Talbot Road Bus Station/Car Park and Prudential House

The Talbot Road Car Park was the country's first true multi-storey car park when completed in 1939. Its current external appearance and internal layout is of an unattractive building with outdated facilities, especially at ground floor level. This, however, disguises the original late deco fabric of the building which is of architectural merit. The building includes a series of decorative relief panels depicting forms of motor transport similar to those on the Council's Municipal Buildings. that will be important to retain Whatever the future of the structure as a whole, the potential contribution of these features to the eventual development scheme will require to be considered.

Developers will also be encouraged to liaise with the owners/tenants of the Prudential House block to seek to secure a development that complements any redevelopment proposals for the Bus Station/Multi Storey.

#### Wilkinsons

The visual appearance of Wilkinsons Store and car park currently is a major impediment to the successful, high quality redevelopment of the Talbot Gateway. Developers are therefore encouraged to liaise with Wilkinsons to seek to secure the redevelopment of this site.

#### Retention of Buildings on Site

7.23 In considering the re-development of the Talbot Gateway site the Council is concerned to ensure that due consideration is given to a number of existing buildings that have historic value and the potential value that they can contribute in terms of context, continuity and sustainability within a regenerated area. The Grade II Listed Former Odeon Cinema, currently in use as 'Funny Girls' marks an important landmark at the edge of the town centre. Development proposals should also seek to retain the finer grained block adjacent to Funny Girls fronting Dickson Road which contributes to its historic setting.

7.24 The Ramsden Arms is considered to be a good example of an inter-war public house and provides a distinctive townscape asset within the streetscene. There is a growing awareness of the need to retain the best of the town's building heritage and development proposals for the Gateway should seek to safeguard this building.

7.25 The Victorian 'Hop' public house at the northern head of Cookson Street/ King Street is a particularly fine building and will need to be retained. It makes a significant townscape contribution to the character area in terms of form and active frontage, especially appropriate within the mix necessary in the development of an animated 'cultural' quarter.

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	016	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
ReBlackpool			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 7 - Design Parameters and Principles			
Page no			
-			
Section			
General			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>The Board recognises that comprehensive redevelopment of the Talbot Gateway site will call for substantial investment in highway and public transport infrastructure and public realm, and prospective developers will be obliged to look for creative ways of developing value. This will inevitably result in proposals to build upwards which has become an increasingly fashionable and acceptable way of generating value.</p>			
Changes Sought			
<p>Against this background the Board would suggest that the development process would be assisted by clear direction and guidance on high buildings. Part 7 contains a number of contradictory statements on this matter. The Board would welcome clarity and recognition that high buildings within the Talbot Gateway site, particularly in the vicinity of the railway station, could create a strong visual reference for this important arrival and departure location. Clearly, it will be important to stress that high buildings will be judged on their individual merits and against specific criteria. In this respect it would be prudent to build these criteria into the Talbot Gateway Brief.</p>			
Council's Response			
<p>The delivery of high quality architecture and public realm will itself develop values, particularly where a strong visual and active identity is developed for the area that creates a distinctive sense of place enabling robust marketing. The use of taller buildings will have a role in defining a locus towards the centre of the site providing their individual and collective forms result in a gradual visual layering rising from the domestic scale of the surrounding areas.</p> <p>The use of height will be subject to assessment of strategic views of the Grade I Listed Blackpool Tower from surrounding key transport routes and the introduction of visually competing forms within the setting of the town centre skyline group. Para 7.17 requires that a strategic view appraisal is conducted to determine specific limitations on the developable envelope in terms of informing scale and form relative to siting.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
<p>Amend para 7.51 to state:</p> <p>consolidation of the town centre skyline, the consideration of strategic views of the Tower and the avoidance of visually competing structures will be the core defining criteria as to what will be an appropriate developable envelope. The use of taller buildings will have a role in defining a locus towards the centre of the site providing their individual and collective forms result in a gradual visual layering rising from the domestic scale of the surrounding areas. The translation of scale and massing into an architectural form that addresses the human scale of surrounding routes and spaces will also be important in determining whether scale can be assimilated in a responsive way. Redevelopment will need to assimilate and support new and existing landmarks with the arrangement of buildings reflecting the cultural order of the uses proposed within the context of the surrounding built form. Policy LQ4(B) provides the context for this in stating that:</p> <p>under Blackpool North Railway Station sub-heading:</p> <p>North Railway Station</p>			<p>The</p> <p>Also add</p> <p>Blackpool</p>

Blackpool North, in its current truncated, 'sunken' form, either disgorges passengers onto a busy one-way system with little to announce a sense of arrival at the resort or even of a sense of place, or into a subway access to the town centre via the rear of the Wilkinson's building, compounding the unwelcoming character of the arrival experience. The improvement of access to Blackpool North Station in the context of the wider redevelopment of the area represents an important component in the re-connection of this key transport facility with the resort and town centre. It is considered that this will be best achieved through a complete re-modelling of the Station through a redevelopment that creates a new transport interchange allied to a mixture of commercial, civic and/or residential uses. Subject to the assessment of strategic views and the relationship with surrounding buildings, there is an opportunity to create a cluster of high buildings to accommodate these uses within this locale.

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	017	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
ReBlackpool			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 8 - The Approvals Process			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>The Board suggests that this section be updated to take account of changes to the management of planning applications brought about by the amended GDPO (effective date 10 August 2006) which alters the matters to be considered as part of an outline application and introduces the requirement for outline and fully detailed applications to submit one statement covering both "Design and Access". This is intended to "allow applicants to demonstrate an integrated approach that will deliver inclusive design, and address a full range of access requirements throughout the design process". (DCLG Circular 01/2006).</p>			
Changes Sought			
As above.			
Council's Response			
Point accepted, and similarly dealt with by appropriate amendment as set out in response to 006/18			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
<p>Third para of section on "planning applications" in Part 8 amended to state:          Planning applications for phased development may be submitted in outline or in full. All applications must demonstrate consistency with the criteria set out in Parts 4 to 7 of this Brief. Outline applications shall include details of layout and access to the development for approval and a Design and Access Statement. Additional supporting details are required and shall include information on the uses proposed, the amount of development for each use and scale parameters of the upper and lower limits for height, width and length of each proposed building. Part 8 Urban Design Statement to be amended to read.</p> <p>`Design and Access Statements`</p> <p>Design and Access Statements are required in support of any planning application. In the case of outline applications a D&amp;AS should be submitted his at the same time. With subsequent reserved matters/detailed applications it will be a condition of the outline that these are submitted and agreed in advance of a reserved matters/detailed submission in order to assess amendments arising from consideration of the outline Design and Access Statement</p> <p>The second sentence to be amended to read. " In addition, the D&amp;AS will need to incorporate details setting out: (Bullet list – add further bullet * A Phasing, Implementation and Mitigation Strategy setting out the management of the development in the context of the site and wider resort will be required)</p> <p>Delete sentence after following bullet. Reading `The above will need.....`</p>			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
006	018	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Reg Haslam	18-Aug-06	23-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
ReBlackpool			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 8 - The Approvals Process			
Page no			
-			
Section			
General			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>The Board suggest that in order to avoid confusion, the type of additional details requested to be submitted in support of outline planning applications is brought into line with that described in paragraph 52 of Circular 01/2006 which outlines five key areas where supporting information may be supplied. These are use, amount of development, indicative layout, scale parameters and indicative access points.</p>			
Changes Sought			
As above.			
Council's Response			
It will also be important to highlight the submission requirements with regard to Design & Access Statements.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
<p>Third para of section on "planning applications" in Part 8 amended to state:            Planning applications for phased development may be submitted in outline or in full. All applications must demonstrate consistency with the criteria set out in Parts 4 to 7 of this Brief. Outline applications shall include details of layout and access to the development for approval and a Design and Access Statement. Additional supporting details are required and shall include information on the uses proposed, the amount of development for each use and scale parameters of the upper and lower limits for height, width and length of each proposed building. Part 8 Urban Design Statement to be amended to read.</p> <p>`Design and Access Statements`</p> <p>Design and Access Statements are required in support of any planning application. In the case of outline applications a D&amp;AS should be submitted his at the same time. With subsequent reserved matters/detailed applications it will be a condition of the outline that these are submitted and agreed in advance of a reserved matters/detailed submission in order to assess amendments arising from consideration of the outline Design and Access Statement</p> <p>The second sentence to be amended to read. " In addition, the D&amp;AS will need to incorporate details setting out: (Bullet list – add further bullet * A Phasing, Implementation and Mitigation Strategy setting out the management of the development in the context of the site and wider resort will be required)</p> <p>Delete sentence after following bullet. Reading `The above will need.....`</p>			

Respondent No                      Comment No                      Type

007                                      001                                      Support

Policy                                      Name                                      Date sent                      Date rec'd

-                                      Oliver Howarth                      15-Aug-06                      16-Aug-06

Respondent                                      Agent

Blackpool Transport/Metro Coastlines                     

Part

General

Page no

-

Section

General

Summary of Your Comment

Overall we are strongly in favour of this Planning Brief's aims and aspirations.... We are very encouraged by the wish to have an integrated road/rail transport gateway and to link in the major bus flows with the station and new retail developments.... As a general point we applaud the suggestion that Council offices and general office space could be relocated from the suburbs to the Talbot Gateway. This and the establishment of a major, bus accessible, central food retail facility should both assist in modal shift away from cars by moving desire nodes to the central transport nod, instead of them being scattered across the borough.... In summary, we are keen to work with the Council and developers to achieve a scheme which, through use of sensible bus priority, well sited stops, minimised distances travelled by buses and minimised distances travelled by pedestrians, achieves a significant improvement in the urban built environment and contributes to modal shift within Blackpool.

Changes Sought

None.

Council's Response

Noted

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
---------------	------------	------

007	002	Objection/comment
-----	-----	-------------------

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
--------	------	-----------	------------

-	Oliver Howarth	15-Aug-06	16-Aug-06
---	----------------	-----------	-----------

Respondent	Agent
------------	-------

Blackpool Transport and Metro Coastlines	<input type="checkbox"/>
--	--------------------------

Part

Part 6 - Access and Accessibility

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

We are concerned to ensure that any redevelopment plan simplifies the road network to be used here and ensure that bus routes 5, 7, 11 and 14, coming in from (and going out to) Layton are able to travel straight along the Talbot Road axis. Ideally we would like to see buses given priority on the road network replacing the current figure of 8 gyratory scheme - we would measure the effectiveness of such a priority scheme by considering whether point to point travel times between Talbot Square and the Talbot Road/Devonshire Road junction were faster than for cars travelling between the same points, possibly achieved by bus gates in Talbot Road between the Gateway and the existing Central Business District.

Changes Sought

Within point 6.32 we would like to see the need for this bus link to be made explicit rather than implicit.

Council's Response

Bus priority, accessibility and interchange are an important priority. The brief states:

Para 6.32: Bus priority should be provided for the frequent services on the Talbot Road axis, and stops located within the site so that interchange between these services and those on the north-south corridors can be easily undertaken, as well as facilitating interchange for rail and coach passengers.

Para 6.33: Priority measures will consist of reserved lanes, stop clearways and selective vehicle detection priority measures at signalised junctions.

It would not be appropriate to be further prescriptive within the planning brief; the precise arrangements for buses will depend upon the proposals brought forward by developers and the ensuing appraisal process. It is not possible to guarantee that access arrangements cited can be achieved in the manner suggested at this time.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
007	003	Objection/comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Oliver Howarth	15-Aug-06	16-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Blackpool Transport and Metro Coastlines	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 6 - Access and Accessibility		
Page no	-		
Section	-		
Summary of Your Comment	We need to route bus lines 3, 4 and 15 north-south through this area from Dickson Road to Abingdon Street and vice versa. At present these routes use half of the gyratory in a southbound direction only. We would like to take the opportunity to simplify their route at this point, especially as the simplification of bus routes is a driver of ridership growth.		
Changes Sought	See above.		
Council's Response	See response to comment 002.		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	No change		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
007	004	Objection/Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Oliver Howarth	15-Aug-06	16-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Blackpool Transport and Metro Coastlines	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 6 - Access and Accessibility		
Page no	-		
Section	-		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>The third group of routes affected by the planning brief are the line 2/2C group. At present these routes call into the railway station forecourt and require extensive use of the gyratory system to do so, this means an extra bus is deployed to this group. This indicates the inconvenience of the current station arrangements. Establishing suitable bus stops close by the station is too difficult to achieve within the existing street patter. Possibly the redevelopment plan can involve infilling part of the station taxi-rank to slope the station environs, so that rail passengers emerge into part of the town centre with immediate interchange to all passing bus services. This would also eliminate the pedestrian underpass.</p>		
Changes Sought	As above.		
Council's Response	See response to comment 002. It is not possible to specify such requirements within a planning brief.		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	No change		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
007	005	Objection

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Oliver Howarth	15-Aug-06	16-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
Blackpool Transport and Metro Coastlines	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

Part 3 - The Talbot Gateway

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

We don't necessarily accept the claim that Talbot Road multi-storey needs preserving on the grounds that it is the oldest multi-storey in the UK! See (<http://www.london-footprints.co.uk/galadgarage.htm>) to view earlier examples. The question to ask is whether the building is appropriate for the position or whether it can be made appropriate. If neither, perhaps it ought to be considered for redevelopment rather than acting as a visual and physical obstruction between the gateway and the existing central business district. Perhaps the undercroft can be turned into a diagonal retail mall forming a connection from the Market area to the gateway's shopping development.

Changes Sought

See above.

Council's Response

The Council does not support the listing of the Talbot Road multi-storey. Whether or not the structure is retained within the Talbot Gateway development will be a matter for bidders to consider against the totality of the Council's and re-Blackpool's expectations. It will be important to consider both visual and reuse issues in determining the future of the Talbot Road Car Park.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

Talbot Road multi-storey is now incorporated under a new sub-heading within Part 7 as follows:

Buildings and Areas Where Re-development is Encouraged

Talbot

Road Bus Station/Car Park and Prudential House

The Talbot Road Car Park was the country's first true multi-storey car park when completed in 1939. Its current external appearance and internal layout is of an unattractive building with outdated facilities, especially at ground floor level. This, however, disguises the original late deco fabric of the building which is of architectural merit. The building includes a series of decorative relief panels depicting forms of motor transport similar to those on the Council's Municipal Buildings. that will be important to retain Whatever the future of the structure as a whole, the potential contribution of these features to the eventual development scheme will require to be considered.

Developers will also be encouraged to liaise with the owners/tenants of the Prudential House block to seek to secure a development that complements any redevelopment proposals for the Bus Station/Multi Storey.

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
008	001	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mike Lambden	16-Aug-06	16-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
National Express	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

General
---------

Page no

-
---

Section

General
---------

Summary of Your Comment

We agree that there is an urgent need to address the Talbot Gateway area and make it an attractive entry/departure point for the town as well as providing a sense of arrival. We welcome and support the proposals, subject to the detail being discussed with us in due course. We believe that they will enhance the image of Blackpool in today's world and we would hope that, if all of the planned redevelopments are completed within the town, then it will encourage a new surge of business which in turn will encourage us to increase the range and frequency of services which we operate.

Changes Sought

None
------

Council's Response

Support noted
---------------

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change
-----------

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
008	002	Support	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mike Lambden	16-Aug-06	16-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
National Express			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
General			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>We support the proposal for an all modes interchange based around the rail station. To be fully effective this must also include a wide range of local bus services so as to offer bus links from the coaches to key areas of Blackpool. We do not have data on current access mode to coach for Blackpool but suspect that it is low for bus. One definite benefit of having one quality interchange is that much improved catering and other facilities can be provided.</p>			
Changes Sought			
None.			
Council's Response			
<p>Support noted. Improved interchange between bus and coach is a scheme objective. This is compatible with the Local Transport Plan, which supports an enhanced bus network focused on meeting a wide range of people's transport needs, which will potentially feed into inter-city coach services.</p> <p>The provision of enhanced catering and other facilities will depend upon the detailed proposals that developers submit.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
008	003	Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mike Lambden	16-Aug-06	16-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
National Express			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
General			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>Volumes of coach traffic vary a lot by time of the season. Our basic timetable is little changed throughout the year but we add many extra coaches to cater for demand on busy days. Therefore the facilities at the interchange would have to be able to cater for the advertised departures and arrivals but there needs to be space for extra journeys to be held ready for loading. We would accept that it would be unfeasible to provide enough space for all eventualities within the interchange. Road access from out of the town to the interchange needs to be as easy as possible.</p>			
Changes Sought			
None.			
Council's Response			
<p>The brief cannot contend with unquantified variability of this nature. However, the following is stated in support of vastly improved coach provision and public transport interchange within the site:</p> <p>Para 6.29: National Express provides a year round scheduled services to/from the Coach Station facility on the ground floor of Talbot Road Car Park and re-provision of a terminus facility will be required if removed. Seasonal coach services currently access a second coach station at Lonsdale Road south of the resort and it would be preferable if this could also be incorporated into an overspill facility at the same town centre site, potentially using drop off bays but with remote parking.</p> <p>Furthermore this is compatible with the Local Transport Plan, which is fully supportive of enhanced coach access to Blackpool for scheduled, excursion and package holiday services, in order to offer a further sustainable travel alternative to car.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
009	001	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Paul Dunkerley	11-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Institution of Civil Engineers & Panel for Historical Engineering Works			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>Talbot Road Bus Station and Multi-Storey Car Park was designated as "Historical Engineering Work" no. 1283 in 1983 as the first multi-storey car park in the country. There is interesting detail in the construction of the concrete basement walls. The circular spiral ramps make it easier to use than many modern structures. As this was the first of a genus of structures that are now commonplace, it should receive statutory listing and protection. The appearance and ambience of the building would be improved considerably via the replacement of the solid louvres at the windows with translucent perspex louvres. PHEW would strongly support the retention of this structure, which represents an important stage in the development of the nation's transportation infrastructure.</p>			
Changes Sought			
See above.			
Council's Response			
<p>Blackpool Council does not regard the Talbot Road Car Park as being of merit for listing and would not support any proposal to list. Indeed, whilst no firm decision has yet been taken, the Council anticipates the redevelopment of this building. Nevertheless, the Council recognises that the building is of some historic interest and that the original art deco fabric may still be intact (see change below). Blackpool Council would not support the listing of the Talbot Road Bus Station and Multi-Storey Car Park.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
<p>None as a result of the consultation. However, the following paragraphs are amended under the sub heading: "Buildings and Areas where Re-development is Encouraged"</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Talbot</p> <p>Road Bus Station/Car Park and Prudential House</p> <p>The Talbot Road Car Park was the country's first true multi-storey car park when completed in 1939. Its current external appearance and internal layout is of an unattractive building with outdated facilities, especially at ground floor level. This, however, disguises the original late deco fabric of the building which is of architectural merit. The building includes a series of decorative relief panels depicting forms of motor transport similar to those on the Council's Municipal Buildings. Whatever the future of the structure as a whole, the potential contribution of these features to the eventual development scheme will require to be considered.</p> <p>Developers will also be encouraged to liaise with the owners/tenants of the Prudential House block to seek to secure a development that complements any redevelopment proposals for the Bus Station/Multi Storey.</p>			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
010	001	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Sean Hennessy	07-Aug-06	15-Aug-06

Respondent Agent

Lancashire Fire and Rescue Service

Part

General

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

Agree with range of issues. Please include me on any demolition/access and water supply issues as early as possible.

Changes Sought

None

Council's Response

Noted

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
011	001	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mike Horner	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Amec	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	General		
Summary of Your Comment	The Brief identifies support for a food store of around 7000sq m. Our research to date suggests that there is demand for a larger foodstore.		
Changes Sought	The brief should allow for greater flexibility, for example, it could refer to a foodstore of up to 10,000sq m.		
Council's Response	<p>The draft SPD in referring to a foodstore of around 7,000 sq.m. provides some flexibility and all applications will be considered on their merits. The figure is specifically based on the floorspace currently and typically provided in major convenience foodstores on the Fylde Coast. Provision within foodstores above this size relates to part provision of non-food floorspace, whereas the required format is that of a quality full range convenience retailer. It is not a requirement, but the expectation has previously been that the foodstore would potentially be located in that part of the site outside of the defined town centre. A larger foodstore in the order of 10,000 sq.m. which could potentially include more non-food sales would only accord with policy if focused on the defined town centre and demonstrates a clear functional and spatial relationship with Blackpool Town Centre as defined on Plan 9 of the Planning Brief. This does not necessarily imply that the entire footprint should sit within the defined town centre area. It is also expected that the store would be provided on more than one level and be closely related to other retail and non retail uses within the development. Integration with other building blocks, streets and spaces is also considered to be essential to the creation of a successful public realm.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>Add sentence to end of para 5.18 to state: A larger scale store, potentially including non-food provision, would only be permitted if it demonstrates a clear functional relationship focused on that part of the site within the defined town centre (as on Plan 9).</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
011	002	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mike Horner	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Amec	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	General		
Summary of Your Comment	Non-food retailing is likely to form a component of the mixed use scheme, particularly at ground floor level as part of a vertical mix. Greater support for edge of centre retailing would be helpful.		
Changes Sought	As above.		
Council's Response	<p>The draft SPD provides further detail but its provisions have to be in conformity with the policy requirements for retail development set out in the adopted Local Plan. As such the provision of non-food floorspace in line with policy is directed to that part of the TG site within the defined town centre. No specific limit is put on the scale of floorspace to be provided within the town centre.</p> <p>Again, in line with policy, any further provision of non-food floorspace outside the defined town centre would only be permitted, in line with normal national and local planning policy requirements, if there was shown to be a need for the floorspace and there was no suitable site available in the town centre.</p> <p>In practise all proposals for retail development will be looked at in their totality and applications will be judged against policy based on their overall merit, including taking account of changes to existing provision. The draft SPD additionally identifies that bulky goods retailing will potentially be accepted outside the defined town centre, and that limited ancillary retail development would also be appropriate as part of any major remodelling of Blackpool North Station.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>Add sentence on to para 5.36 to state: <span style="float: right;">All</span>  proposals for retail development will be looked at in their totality and applications will be judged against policy based on their overall merit, including taking account of changes to existing provision.</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
011	003	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mike Horner	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Amec	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	-		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>The railway station is a key component of the site and its improvement will need to include retail development. The station is outside the defined town centre and the contribution that retail development can make to a new rail station, creating a more interesting and vibrant arrival point and destination in its own right, is not fully recognised within the brief.</p>		
Changes Sought	<p>Paragraph 5.38 does say that 'limited ancillary retail development could also be appropriate as part of any major remodelling of Blackpool North Station'. This point could be given a greater emphasis in the brief.</p>		
Council's Response	<p>It is fully accepted that the improvement of North Station will be expected to include retail development. Whereas retail development is generally more restricted outside the town centre, the draft SPD states that ancillary retail development will be permitted as part of any major remodelling of Blackpool North Station. However, in response to the representation, it is considered some further detail can appropriately be included for further clarification.</p> <p><b>BRUCE:</b></p> <p>The railway station's redevelopment is not prerequisite to the site's development, however it is hoped that better access and a superior visitor gateway environment will be achieved. The brief states:</p> <p>Para 6.26: The Council would therefore support a major remodelling of Blackpool North station as part of the Gateway redevelopment. Remodelling of the terminal building and forecourt areas also has potential to help secure and facilitate wider redevelopment in adjacent areas, including the isolated Banks Street car park.</p> <p>Network Rail will retain control of the station and the surrounding land therefore this facility will remain outside the eventual developer's control. Provision of additional retail at this facility would be a matter for Network Rail in partnership with the developer and it is not possible to prejudge any discussions that might occur.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>Amend last sentence para 5.38 to state: <span style="float: right;">Retail</span>  development comprising concourse food and drink, newsagents, bookshops, stationery and other limited ancillary retailing could also be appropriate as part of any major remodeling of Blackpool North Station.</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
011	004	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mike Horner	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Amec	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	General		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>Whilst the brief is supportive of new housing development, in view of its regeneration benefits here, residential proposals would still need to be justified as an exception in accordance with the Council's 'Plan, Monitor, Manage Advice Note'. No overall acceptable housing numbers are given in the brief or how these might need to be phased to ensure that the supply of housing land is managed appropriately.</p>		
Changes Sought	<p>Clearer guidance should be given.</p>		
Council's Response	<p>As stated, the draft SPD is supportive of new housing development in Talbot Gateway. However, further clarification regarding the current restrictive approach and overall limits on numbers can be provided.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>Amend para 5.28 to state: Irrespective of longer term increased levels of housing development, the priority to encourage regeneration and an improved mix and quality of housing fully supports appropriate residential development proposals as part of the comprehensive redevelopment of Talbot Gateway. Such proposals would be expected to be viewed as an exception to the Council's current restricted approach to housing development.</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
---------------	------------	------

011	005	Objection
-----	-----	-----------

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
--------	------	-----------	------------

-	Mike Horner	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
---	-------------	-----------	-----------

Respondent	Agent
------------	-------

Amec	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------

Part

Part 5 - Development Character

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

In accordance with Local Plan Policy, the brief requires 30% of the overall housing numbers as social housing, with a preference for discounted houses to buy or shared ownership meeting a pressing need for 2+bedroom units. No specific numbers are, however, justified for the affordable housing which should be informed by a needs analysis. It is our view that it may not be appropriate to apply this blanket policy in this particular area as it is understood that there is an adequate supply of social housing in Blackpool and the challenge for Talbot Gateway is to create a new housing offer.

Changes Sought

The brief should therefore allow for flexibility in this regard.

Council's Response

A comprehensive new survey of the housing needs of Blackpool residents was undertaken in 2004 and has further informed the Council's understanding of the local housing market and the need for affordable housing. The results of the Survey showed that Blackpool's social stock is only 11.2%, just over half the national average, with an annual need for around 300 more affordable homes than the existing annual supply. The survey indicated strongly that there is an affordability problem, with a key requirement to develop a more balanced housing stock.

The report assessed the particular problems in the inner areas and concluded there is a need to deliver radical change in the nature and quality of housing. The Survey supported an increased level of discounted low cost/ shared ownership housing. It is fully accepted there is a surplus of poor quality low cost private rented housing within the TG wider area, but there is a much more limited supply of social housing and an almost total absence of discounted low cost market and shared ownership social housing in Blackpool (as against social rented housing) which can provide an important first step towards home ownership and a stake in the community.

The Survey concluded the overall affordable housing target should be 30% on new development sites over 0.5 hectares. The Council is focussed on delivering more balanced and healthy communities which best meet local residents needs, with any further on-site provision required either as discounted low cost or shared ownership social housing. Alternatively the Council will seek to encourage and actively promote off-site provision in partnership with Housing Associations, as part of an agreed programme for renewal action to replace, improve and reduce the amount of poor quality rented accommodation and provide a more balanced mix of properties in Blackpool's inner areas.

The approach set out in the draft SPD mirrors this approach and is therefore fully justified. Further clarification regarding the flexibility for off-site provision can be added to the SPD. Similarly a statement can be added that all housing schemes will be looked at in their totality, applying the policies and judging applications on the basis of their overall merits.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

Amend para 5.31 to state:

Any

residential development will be required to provide a good housing mix to meet a wider range of housing needs in accordance with Policies HN6, HN7 and HN8 of the Local Plan including increased numbers of housing units with 2 or more bedrooms. Policy HN8 sets out that a total of 30% of provision would be required to be as social housing which, in the context of the current housing in the immediate locality should either be as discounted homes to buy or shared ownership social housing, with the alternative of providing off-site provision of social housing. All housing schemes will be looked at in their totality, applying the policies and judging applications on the basis of their overall merits.

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
011	006	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mike Horner	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Amec	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	-		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>The brief identifies the site as the potential location for a new cultural quarter but makes no specific reference to A3 (Restaurants and Cafes) and A5 (Hot Food Takeaway) uses that would normally support such areas and are likely to form a key component of development proposals.</p>		
Changes Sought	<p>Paragraph 5.41 refers to ancillary uses, but A3/A5 uses need to be promoted specifically as they will play a crucial role in terms of regenerating and bringing life into the area.</p>		
Council's Response	<p>Reflecting the wide array of potential uses, no specific reference was made at para 5.41 to define ancillary uses. It is accepted, however, that an appropriate level provision for A3 and A5 uses will be required to support the uses across the Talbot Gateway. Such provision is appropriate in conjunction with proposed retail development and is similarly accepted would be appropriate to support a significant new civic and cultural quarter, along with existing provision in the area. Reference to this can therefore be appropriately added under the heading of ancillary uses at the end of Part 5 of the draft SPD.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>Add new para 5.42 to state: <span style="float: right;">In</span>  in addition to the main uses identified, it is recognised that restaurants, cafes and other ancillary uses will also perform an integral role serving the needs of the various developments and adding to the vitality of the area.</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
011	007	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mike Horner	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Amec	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	-		
Summary of Your Comment	The brief refers to the desire to retain the bowls facility, but it is unclear why this is so important. We would wish to see a more flexible approach to this. Since our meeting with ReBlackpool on 10th August we understand that this is no longer the position and trust that the brief will be revised accordingly.		
Changes Sought	Point accepted.		
Council's Response	Point accepted. The future of the Indoor Bowls Club was considered by Blackpool Council Executive on 28th June 2006 when it was determined no replacement provision was required to be made in the TG redevelopment scheme.		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	Para 5.41 to be amended to state: accordance with Policy SR3, the Council has undertaken a detailed assessment of the usage of the existing bowls facility which has been is shown to be surplus to requirements, and will not need to be replaced within the redevelopment area (indoor bowls will subsequently be taken into account when considering multi-purpose indoor leisure provision in the North Shore area). In		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
---------------	------------	------

011	008	Objective
-----	-----	-----------

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
--------	------	-----------	------------

-	Mike Horner	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
---	-------------	-----------	-----------

Respondent	Agent
------------	-------

Amec	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	--------------------------

Part

Part 5 - Development Character

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

The future proofing along Talbot Road for a tram link corridor will require consideration regarding issues such as vibration, location of utilities and overall strategic highway alignment.

Changes Sought

It would be helpful if the brief could provide further details on the tram link aspiration.

Council's Response

It is not possible to progress the tram proposal as suggested at this stage, particularly as resources to renew the current tramway alignment are not confirmed by Department for Transport at the time of writing. Developers are expected to bring forward proposals for the tramway and other public transport interchange within their proposals and should not be constrained by a fixed tram alignment. The importance of retaining the tramway link is fully recognised in the Brief..

Tram vehicles are designed to operate in constrained urban areas therefore vibration and noise impacts will be minimal. Air quality is expected to benefit from the availability of an emission free alternative to car trips.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
011	009	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Mike Horner	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Amec	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 7 - Design Parameters and Principles		
Page no	-		
Section	-		
Summary of Your Comment	There is no reference to heights of buildings. It is therefore assumed there is no limitation on height.		
Changes Sought	For clarification, the brief could be more specific in this regard.		
Council's Response	Para 7.17 requires the undertaking of a strategic view appraisal. This will allow consideration of height and siting along with appraisal of the relationships proposed between existing blocks and buildings and public realm.		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>Amend para 7.51 to state:</p> <p>The consolidation of the town centre skyline, the consideration of strategic views of the Tower and the avoidance of visually competing structures will be the core defining criteria as to what will be an appropriate developable envelope. The use of taller buildings will have a role in defining a locus towards the centre of the site providing their individual and collective forms result in a gradual visual layering rising from the domestic scale of the surrounding areas. The translation of scale and massing into an architectural form that addresses the human scale of surrounding routes and spaces will also be important in determining whether scale can be assimilated in a responsive way. Redevelopment will need to assimilate and support new and existing landmarks with the arrangement of buildings reflecting the cultural order of the uses proposed within the context of the surrounding built form. Policy LQ4(B) provides the context for this in stating that:</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
---------------	------------	------

012	001	Objection
-----	-----	-----------

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
--------	------	-----------	------------

-	Adam Leach	14-Aug-06	16-Aug-06
---	------------	-----------	-----------

Respondent	Agent
------------	-------

Grattan Plc	<input type="checkbox"/>
-------------	--------------------------

Part
------

General
---------

Page no
---------

-
---

Section
---------

-
---

Summary of Your Comment
-------------------------

An integral part of our success is the parking facilities provided. Some of our goods are bulky in their nature, providing car parking near to the store is therefore important to ensure customers can transport goods away with ease. Consequently, we would either like to remain in situ or, should a development plan involving demolition of the Wilkinson's site move forward, we would seek new accommodation that mirrors our existing space and facilities.
---

Changes Sought
----------------

--

Council's Response
--------------------

<p>The nature of the business and desirability of convenient parking is understood. Amendments are being made to the Brief in response to representations to provide more clarity about which buildings the Council would encourage for redevelopment. This includes the Wilkinsons building. Precisely which areas/buildings may be included in any eventual redevelopment, however, is not determined by the SPD and will only be determined as part of the eventual preparation of detailed development proposals by the Council's eventual selected developer partner. A key part of this process will be the production of a Re-location Strategy that will consider the desirability of re-locating individual users within the site. The preferred developer selected by the Council will therefore be expected to present a robust case for redevelopment proposals that includes full and proper consideration of existing users. It will then require detailed proposals progressed through subsequent planning applications in conjunction with the statutory basis provided by the Local Plan and Talbot Gateway SPD to provide any necessary basis for CPO powers.</p> <p>It is therefore further recommended in response to representations that additional reference should also be included in the SPD requiring a clear "relocation strategy" to be part and parcel of the proposals to be produced by the Council's eventual selected developer partner for existing uses within the site.</p>
--

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief
---

New sub-section to be added after para 7.19 of the Brief on "Buildings and Areas Where Development is Encouraged". It is further recommended in response to representations that additional reference should also be included in Part 8 of the Brief requiring a clear "relocation strategy" that assesses existing uses within the site to be part and parcel of the proposals to be produced by the Council's eventual selected developer partner for existing uses within the site.
--

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
013	001	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	-	27-Jul-06	02-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
David Benton	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	Supporting Development		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>I protest at the lack of care and interest shown to older members of this community. On Monday 3rd July you stated in the Gazette that the demolition would be in about 2yrs and you hoped to relocate the bowling hall to another site on the north shore. This week we are told it will close in March 2007 and there are no plans to provide us with another venue. It is suggested that the club loses money and is a drain on Council finances. It is also suggested that the centre is not well used. In fact the venue caters for 11 different groups and competitions, some meeting weekly. This does not seem to be a venue that has no use. Very serious consideration should be given to less active members of this community.</p>		
Changes Sought	<p>This is a very important facility to a lot of senior citizens and should never be lost to them.</p>		
Council's Response	<p>The Bowls facility is centrally located within the Talbot Gateway site. Its position is such that it would substantially inhibit the redevelopment of the area. The proposed redevelopment of the Gateway was subject to extensive consultation on the Blackpool Local Plan. In response to an objection from Sport England the Inspector in his report on the Local Plan recommended that a replacement facility would need to be provided unless it was shown surplus to requirements.</p> <p>.</p> <p>The report in the local press followed the Council Executive's consideration of a report on the future of the Indoor Bowls Hall on 28th June 2006. The Executive were given details of current useage, with 400 regular members, details of league use and casual play, and details of the financial position.</p> <p>In the context of the Council's Leisure Strategy and delivery of leisure services, it was concluded that the club served a small number of Blackpool residents and required council support to continue. It was concluded no replacement provision was required to be made in the TG redevelopment scheme; that revenue monies currently paid to the Club be ring-fenced for use by Leisure Services in developing bowling; and that indoor bowling be taken into account when considering multi-purpose indoor leisure provision in the North Shore area.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>Para 5.41 to be amended to state: In accordance with Policy SR3, the Council has undertaken a detailed assessment of the usage of the existing bowls facility which has been is shown to be surplus to requirements, and will not need to be replaced within the redevelopment area (indoor bowls will subsequently be taken into account when considering multi-purpose indoor leisure provision in the North Shore area).</p>		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
014	001	Support	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Alexa Brain	18-Aug-06	21-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Drivers Jonas on behalf of Leisure Parcs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
General			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>We regard the Talbot Gateway Draft Planning Brief as a positive step towards the regeneration of Blackpool and Leisure Parcs are fully supportive in the principle of this approach. We feel that the document is well written, presented in a user-friendly format and is comprehensive in most respects. We would like to express Leisure Parcs commitment to and support for the Council in its aspirations for the Talbot Gateway site and the Draft Planning Brief. We also recognise the vital role that the redevelopment of this area will play in conjunction with other regeneration areas of the Town, for example, the Conference Leisure Quarter. Leisure Parcs would like to play an active part in the realisation of this and every other regeneration project in Blackpool and will support and work with the Council and other relevant bodies to bring these aspirations to fruition.</p>			
Changes Sought			
No change.			
Council's Response			
Support noted			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
None			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
014	002	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Alexa Brain	18-Aug-06	21-Aug-06

Respondent Agent  
 Drivers Jonas on behalf of Leisure Parcs

Part  
 Part 6 - Access and Accessibility

Page no  
 -

Section  
 Transport Requirements

Summary of Your Comment  
 The inevitable loss of important existing public car parks is a key concern for Leisure Parcs. These car parks serve an important function in enabling visitors to park and gain easy access to the Town's attractions. Careful consideration must be given to the way in which the spaces will be replaced. The loss of existing spaces and reprovision would require careful phasing to ensure minimum disruption to members of the public. The Draft Brief refers only to the replacement of short stay provision. Intermediate and long stay provision is not protected in the same way. It is essential that the Draft Brief requires proposed schemes to include or make suitable provision for at least an equivalent number of spaces as those being lost. If Blackpool is to meet its aspirations for the future and compete with other visitor destinations, it is inevitable that the overall parking requirements will increase over time. A net loss of parking spaces is likely to have a detrimental effect on the visitor economy.

Changes Sought  
 Provision of replacement parking spaces should therefore be provided as a minimum.

Council's Response  
 Parking spaces within the current site are not recognised as being best placed to cater for long stay tourist visitor use; the site is not immediately adjacent to the major attractions. Provision of parking is being considered at a resort-wide level and is regarded as currently satisfactory. The precise mix of parking provision and its amount will depend upon the proposals that developers submit; the brief aims to set minimum standards and provide broad guidance. However, further clarification on car parking is to be included in the brief as follows:

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief  
 6.11A The future scale of provision is dependent on the precise mix of uses that come forward, with the key need to ensure sufficient short term parking conveniently located and integrated with the existing town centre. In total, 1,200 short stay public spaces therefore require to be retained/redeveloped within the Talbot Gateway site. Of these, approximately two thirds are required to be provided within the defined town centre part of the site. In addition, a minimum of 600 longer stay spaces require to be provided within the Talbot Gateway site to meet existing needs.  
 6.11B In addition to the foregoing, adequate parking will be required for all new development within Talbot Gateway in line with Local Plan maximum standards (see para 6.16). Within these terms, the integration of different users parking provision is encouraged by the Council. Where this is achievable, the potential for the shared provision and resultant reduction in the overall number of spaces should also be considered.

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
014	003	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Alexa Brain	18-Aug-06	21-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Drivers Jonas on behalf of Leisure Parcs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Transport Requirements			
Summary of Your Comment			
Equally as important as the number of spaces provided is the type of spaces represented. The majority at present are short stay however the majority of visitors require intermediate or long-stay provision.			
Changes Sought			
Intermediate and long term spaces are currently underrepresented and the redevelopment should be used as an opportunity to redress the balance.			
Council's Response			
Council policy has been to reduce the proportion of long stay car parking spaces in favour of short stay to support the retail offer. The proportion of long versus short stay car parking on the site will depend upon the proposals that developers submit. There is no immediate shortage of long stay car parking across the resort, nor is there any proven need to provide more long stay car parking in this location. The site is prioritised for revenue generating activities in order to regenerate Blackpool; over provision of car parking of all types would militate against this.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
<p>6.11A The future scale of provision is dependent on the precise mix of uses that come forward, with the key need to ensure sufficient short term parking conveniently located and integrated with the existing town centre. In total, 1,200 short stay public spaces therefore require to be retained/redeveloped within the Talbot Gateway site. Of these, approximately two thirds are required to be provided within the defined town centre part of the site. In addition, a minimum of 600 longer stay spaces require to be provided within the Talbot Gateway site to meet existing needs.</p> <p>6.11B In addition to the foregoing, adequate parking will be required for all new development within Talbot Gateway in line with Local Plan maximum standards (see para 6.16). Within these terms, the integration of different users parking provision is encouraged by the Council. Where this is achievable, the potential for the shared provision and resultant reduction in the overall number of spaces should also be considered.</p>			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
014	004	Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Alexa Brain	18-Aug-06	21-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Drivers Jonas on behalf of Leisure Parcs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 6 - Access and Accessibility		
Page no	-		
Section	Transport Assessment - Impact		
Summary of Your Comment	It is vital that accessibility is not only maintained whilst the Talbot Gateway's transformation is underway, but is considered as a vital priority in the scheme that is taken forward. Failure to do this could have major repercussions on the Town as a whole and undermine the principles of the regeneration agenda.		
Changes Sought	None.		
Council's Response	<p>Developers' will be expected to maintain the maximum accessibility during the construction process. The Brief supports enhanced accessibility for the site area and the wider resort stating the following:</p> <p>Para 6.2: In summary, ease of access, quality arrival points, parking reception and interchange facilities are essential components of a successful edge-of-centre Gateway development. The site must also integrate with and support existing town centre uses, especially in relation to short and long stay parking, bus access and egress and reception facilities for coach and train arrivals.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	No change		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
---------------	------------	------

014	005	Comment
-----	-----	---------

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
--------	------	-----------	------------

-	Alexa Brain	18-Aug-06	21-Aug-06
---	-------------	-----------	-----------

Respondent	Agent
------------	-------

Drivers Jonas on behalf of Leisure Parcs	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
--	-------------------------------------

Part

Part 5 - Development Character

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

Phasing should feature as a key issue in the early stages of planning discussions involving all interested parties to avoid difficulties later on. It is paramount that careful consideration is given to the way in which the site operates in the interim period. The redevelopment of the area could take up to five years, it is essential, therefore, to ensure minimum disruption to existing services and facilities during that time period.

Changes Sought

None.

Council's Response

The way in which the overall development is phased and managed is agreed will be an important consideration in the selection of a preferred development partner, in subsequent planning applications and in the implementation of the development. Part 8 of the draft SPD emphasises the need for a comprehensive approach for the phased redevelopment of the site ,consistent with an agreed overall concept masterplan to ensure full consideration in conjunction with the interests of adjoining sites.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

Third para of section on "planning applications" in Part 8 amended to state:  
Planning applications for phased development may be submitted in outline or in full. All applications must demonstrate consistency with the criteria set out in Parts 4 to 7 of this Brief. Outline applications shall include details of layout and access to the development for approval and a Design and Access Statement. Additional supporting details are required and shall include information on the uses proposed, the amount of development for each use and scale parameters of the upper and lower limits for height, width and length of each proposed building. Part 8 Urban Design Statement to be amended to read.

`Design and Access Statements`

Design and Access Statements are required in support of any planning application. In the case of outline applications a D&AS should be submitted his at the same time. With subsequent reserved matters/detailed applications it will be a condition of the outline that these are submitted and agreed in advance of a reserved matters/detailed submission in order to assess amendments arising from consideration of the outline Design and Access Statement

The second sentence to be amended to read. " In addition, the D&AS will need to incorporate details setting out: (Bullet list – add further bullet \* A Phasing, Implementation and Mitigation Strategy setting out the management of the development in the context of the site and wider resort will be required)

Delete sentence after following bullet. Reading `The above will need.....`)

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
014	006	Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Alexa Brain	18-Aug-06	21-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Drivers Jonas on behalf of Leisure Parcs			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
General			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>The Conference Leisure Quarter site and the Talbot Gateway site are located at either side of Blackpool Town Centre and represent 'gateways' into the Town. If consideration to the way in which the redevelopment of the sites is phased is not given priority, the short term disruption caused could have a long term detrimental impact on the Blackpool visitor economy. This would not only undermine the Council's regeneration agenda but cause irretrievable harm to Blackpool as a tourist destination.</p>			
Changes Sought			
None.			
Council's Response			
<p>The way in which the overall development is phased and managed will be an important consideration in the selection of a preferred development partner, in subsequent planning applications and in the implementation of the development. The need is recognised in Part 6 of the draft SPD to ensure that development proposals maintain a supply of required parking provision to support existing functions as part of a phased redevelopment. A full Transport Assessment will be required in support of development proposals which will need to be undertaken on the basis of an integrated assessment of future development and traffic growth in the wider town centre and resort.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
015	001	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Dan Mitchell	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06

Respondent Agent

Barton Willmore on behalf of St. Modwen

Part

General

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

St Modwen supports the identification of the Talbot Gateway site as a location for renaissance within Blackpool. St Modwen is keen to work with the Council to secure a comprehensive, phased, redevelopment scheme to deliver transformational change, greatly strengthening and integrating with the adjoining town centre through a distinctive mixed use gateway redevelopment of exceptional quality. St Modwen considers the site to offer a range of opportunities that will contribute significantly to re-establishing Blackpool as the major centre for the Fylde Coast.

Changes Sought

None.

Council's Response

Support noted

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

None

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
015	002	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Dan Mitchell	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Barton Willmore on behalf of St Modwen			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General - Test of Soundness			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
St Modwen seek clarification regarding the timing of the SPD in relation to the emerging LDF and Core Strategy. The Companion Guide to PPS 12 states that existing planning guidance cannot be automatically transferred into the LDF, nor can it become an SPD. The LDS for Blackpool suggests that the Core Strategy will only be started in January 2007.			
Changes Sought			
The adoption of the SPD should be delayed until the Core Strategy has emerged and a development partner appointed. This would ensure the SPD is 'future proof' for the life of the 5yr scheme.			
Council's Response			
<p>The Talbot Gateway Planning Brief is contained as an SPD within Blackpool Council's Local Development Scheme. It is new guidance that has been prepared in conformity with the Blackpool Local Plan which was adopted in June 2006, supplementing Policy SR3 of the Local Plan. Under the new system the adopted plan retains development plan status and its policies are automatically saved for 3 years until June 2009. Work on the Core Strategy is timetabled will commence in 2007 in conjunction with progress towards an adopted NWRSS.</p> <p>It is not feasible or desirable to replace Policy SR3 and other relevant local plan policies related to Talbot Gateway in advance of this. In these circumstances the Secretary of State's approval will be sought to extend the period of saved policies as appropriate, and is fully expected will be approved in line with paras 5.3 - 5.5 of PPS12. This will maintain continuous development plan status for the relevant policies and supporting status for the SPD, and bridge any gap until the adoption of a new Core Strategy DPD.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
None			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
015	003	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Dan Mitchell	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Barton Willmore on behalf of St Modwen	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Part	General		
Page no	-		
Section	General		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>By adopting the SPD prior to consideration of each masterplan submission as part of the current competition, the Council could potentially be restricting the development opportunity. Potential major operators may identify themselves only once a scheme is 'visible'. Therefore the draft SPD may need to be amended to include such a major use.</p>		
Changes Sought	<p>Blackpool Council should consider the potential need to delay adoption of the SPD until such time as the preferred developer has been appointed and masterplan finalised. Given that only 6 months are required to produce a SPD (or potentially less given the progress and public consultation so far by Blackpool Council) and having regard to the Council's programme for appointment, this would not delay any timings for the submission of a planning application.</p>		
Council's Response	<p>The Planning Brief provides prospective bidders/developers with detailed guidance on Blackpool Council's policies for the Talbot Gateway site consistent with the policies contained within its Adopted Local Plan. Both documents have followed consultation processes that have enabled their content to be challenged and amended as appropriate. Developers in preparing their schemes need to have regard to the requirements set out in the planning brief and It is expected that schemes will generally be in accordance with both the Local Plan and the Planning Brief. It is the role of the Council's adopted SPD to provide guidance for the preferred developer and not for it be subsequently amended to take account of major uses that may come forward. A wide range of potential uses is identified in the SPD with substantial flexibility as to the precise package of uses that could come forward and all schemes will be looked at in their totality, applying the policies and judging them on the basis of their overall merits.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	No change		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
015	004	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Dan Mitchell	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Barton Willmore on behalf of St Modwen			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
General			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>The site is 12.8ha of which a major part comprises the railway lines and Blackpool North Station providing a fixed constraint. The draft SPD suggests that the redevelopment scheme must make provision for a significant number of different uses to provide the core components. By providing a very detailed list of required uses on site, the Council is potentially limiting the regeneration opportunity and flexibility required by the Draft SPD. The Draft SPD is rightly aspirational for the Talbot Gateway, however, the existing constraints will shape the actual development brought forward.</p>			
Changes Sought			
More flexibility.			
Council's Response			
<p>It is unclear what further flexibility is sought. The core development components identified in the SPD are entirely consistent with the requirements of the adopted Local Plan and earlier stated objectives of the Council in its marketing of the site. How they are configured, consistent with planning policy is to a large extent a matter for the developers in determining the way forward in developing their proposals. It is accepted that the existing rail lines and Blackpool North station are constraints, but the SPD clearly states that a major remodeling of Blackpool North Station would be supported by the Council as part of the Talbot Gateway redevelopment. A wide range of potential uses is identified in the SPD with substantial flexibility as to the precise package of uses that could come forward and all schemes will be looked at in their totality, applying the policies and judging them on the basis of their overall merits.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
None			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
015	005	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Dan Mitchell	16-Aug-06	17-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Barton Willmore on behalf of St Modwen			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
Some of the relevant Local Plan policies are too restrictive. Aspects of the draft SPD are too restrictive. St Modwen is mindful that the Draft SPD could be considered inflexible and challenged by a third party in respect of the test of soundness advocated in paragraph 4.24 (ix) of PPS 12.			
Changes Sought			
Increased flexibilitiy.			
Council's Response			
The purpose of the Planning Brief is to provide guidance on a range of issues, but expressly it is a supplementary planning document providing further detailed guidance on relevant policies set out in the adopted Local Plan. As such, the Local Plan policies can be clarified by further detail, but cannot be changed through the SPD consultation process. Subject to alterations that are being made as a result of this consultation process, the Council is of the opinion that the Brief, in combination with the Local Plan, will strike a balance between providing robust guidance and enabling flexibility of response.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
016	001	Objection

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Simon Flisher	17-Aug-06	18-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
Barton Willmore on behalf of Wilkinson's	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Part

General - Test of Soundness

Page no

-

Section

-

Summary of Your Comment

The landowner Wilkinson Hardware Stores Ltd do not feel they have been adequately consulted based on the following: (a) in general, inadequate consultation was undertaken in advance of publication; (b) the Council consulted store staff rather than the landowner; (c) ODPM advocates informal negotiations undertaken in parallel with preparations for compulsory purchase orders; (d) PPS12 advocates early community involvement and front-loading as well as one-to-one meeting with selected stakeholders (Wilkinson considers itself to merit this approach due to its strategic location); (e) the Council's draft SCI states that landowners can be easily identified via previous involvement.

Changes Sought

Greater consultation

Council's Response

The SPD is a draft document at this stage, and the response that has been made by Wilkinsons has resulted from the statutory 6 week consultation period, ending on August 19th 2006. In the absence of an owners address on the planning records at the beginning of the consultation period at the start of June, it is accepted consultation on the draft SPD was made with the Wilkinson store address within Talbot Gateway, with it then being the responsibility of the store manager to forward the consultation as required. This is presumed to have been the process that has resulted in the consultation response. Parallel to this ReBlackpool URC has met with Wilkinsons, including with Sean Savage, the Store Manager. A copy of the marketing brochure for the Talbot Gateway was also provided to Wilkinsons. The SPD itself clarifies the Council's planning policies providing more detailed guidance on the policies set out in the Blackpool Local Plan. Prior to the SPD there was extensive consultation throughout the preparation of the Local Plan including formal advertisements, all householders, businesses and local organisations. The PPS12 consultation on the SPD has been undertaken in accordance with and very substantially exceeding the PPS12 requirements.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
016	002	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Simon Flisher	17-Aug-06	18-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Barton Willmore on behalf of Wilkinson's	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Part	General		
Page no	-		
Section	-		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>The Planning Brief lacks sufficient detail in order to provide a spatial and procedural framework within which redevelopment of the Talbot Gateway can take place. There is no plan included which shows exactly what land use or building type is proposed for the Wilkinson site. The brief refers to a phase 1, concentrated on lands to the south and east of Talbot Road, however no plan defines this area and no details of proposals are given. No clear timescale is given for Phase 1 and subsequent phases, including CPOs. No details of the number of phases envisaged are given. Circular 06/2004 specifies that, without a clear idea of how it will use the site and what resources will be available within a reasonable timescale, it will be difficult for an authority to show that a compulsory purchase order is in the public interest. Wilkinson feels the brief fails to provide for effective delivery and generates uncertainty. At this stage it does not meet the requirements of CPO guidance.</p>		
Changes Sought	See above.		
Council's Response	<p>The detail sought in the objection will emerge through the bidding process. The requirement for any compulsory purchase orders will be pursued in accordance with statute. Any such procedure will be informed by the statutory and non statutory planning framework and any subsequent planning permissions for the development. The SPD is part of a comprehensive approach and has been prepared for consultation to clarify the council's planning policies and provide further detailed guidance for the Council's eventual preferred developer partner in progressing their detailed proposals for the development of the Talbot Gateway site.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	No change		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
016	003	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Simon Flisher	17-Aug-06	18-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Barton Willmore on behalf of Wilkinson's	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Part	General		
Page no	-		
Section	-		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>Wilkinson's object that their store is not safeguarded in the draft brief for the following reasons; (a) Wilkinson's is currently the major retail anchor within the Talbot Gateway; (b) its loss would reduce the vitality and viability of that area of the Talbot Gateway currently designated as Town Centre; (c) it will reduce the choice of retail options currently expected and enjoyed by Blackpool's consumers; (d) it will mean the loss of a popular and very well used shop currently trading seven days per week; (e) it will mean the loss of a nationally recognised 'high street brand' from Blackpool's town centre; (f) it will mean the loss of a retail unit currently providing quality and value goods in a manner very well suited to Blackpool's retail demographic; (g) it will oppose the objectives detailed in PPS6; (h) the store is not divorced from the prime shopping and tourist areas, the building has been in active A1 use for nearly 30yrs; (i) the building is structurally sound and has successfully adapted to meet changing needs for nearly 30yrs. The demolition of the building would be unsustainable in light of the fact that measures could be put in place to enhance the external appearance of the building.</p>		
Changes Sought	<p>The Planning Brief should give greater priority to the retention of the Wilkinson store.</p>		
Council's Response	<p>The purpose of the SPD is to provide more detailed policy guidance to secure comprehensive redevelopment proposals for the Talbot Gateway. Precisely what areas/buildings may be included in any eventual redevelopment proposals is not determined by the SPD and will only be determined subsequently as part of the eventual preparation of detailed development proposals by the Council's eventual selected development partner.</p> <p>Notwithstanding this, the Council would ideally wish to see the Wilkinsons building redeveloped and the brief is being amended to reflect this scenario. The Council is also anxious that this proposal be pursued in full consultation with Wilkinsons and this is reflected in the wording. The Council will also require developers to submit a clear relocation strategy that sets out where, whether and how existing users are intended to be relocated. If the Wilkinsons building was to be redeveloped, this would clearly include Wilkinsons and the current expectation is that alternative premises would be provided within the overall Talbot Gateway redevelopment.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	<p>No change in direct response to this representation, but in response to representations a new sub-section to be added after para 7.19 of the Brief on "Buildings and Areas Where Development is Encouraged".</p> <p>Wilkinsons</p> <p>The visual appearance of Wilkinsons Store and car park currently is a major impediment to the successful, high quality redevelopment of the Talbot Gateway. Developers are therefore encouraged to liaise with Wilkinsons to seek to secure the redevelopment of this site.</p>		

It is further recommended in response to representations that additional reference should also be included in Part 8 of the Brief requiring a clear "relocation strategy" that assesses existing uses within the site to be part and parcel of the proposals to be produced by the Council's eventual selected developer partner for existing uses within the site.

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
016	004	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Simon Flisher	17-Aug-06	18-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Barton Willmore on behalf of Wilkinson's			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 5 - Development Character			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
The Wilkinson Car Park is an important facility within the Talbot Gateway and its recognised 'Gold Standard' of quality, including security barriers and effective lighting, should be acknowledged by the brief. The loss of the car park would have severe detrimental impacts.			
Changes Sought			
The brief should acknowledge the value of the car park and give greater priority to its retention.			
Council's Response			
Recognition is included in Part 6 of the Brief to the particular importance of short term parking convenient for the town centre. This includes the Wilkinson car park provision. It is accepted that greater clarification should be included of the importance of these spaces. However, it is the quantum and location of spaces that is considered important rather than the particular need to retain specific car parks. It will be a matter for the Council's eventual selected developer partner to shape the more detailed proposals for the future redevelopment of the Talbot Gateway in accordance with the guidance in the Brief.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change in response to this specific representation, but greater clarity to be included in Part 6 of the Brief on future parking requirements, distinguishing between short and long stay needs.			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
016	005	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Simon Flisher	17-Aug-06	18-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Barton Willmore on behalf of Wilkinson's	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		
Part	General		
Page no	-		
Section	-		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>The redevelopment proposals could necessitate the use of Compulsory Purchase Orders. It is considered that the use of CPO power in respect of the proposals contained in the brief as currently drafted would not comply with the provisions of the regulations (section 99). The brief also fails to make the compelling case for the redevelopment proposals needed to justify use of CPO powers.</p>		
Changes Sought	See above.		
Council's Response	<p>It is accepted the proposals prepared for Talbot Gateway as currently drafted in the SPD would not on their own be sufficient to justify a compelling case for the use of CPO powers. The SPD is part of a comprehensive approach and has been prepared for consultation to clarify the council's planning policies and provide further detailed guidance for the Council's eventual preferred developer partner in progressing their detailed proposals for the development of the Talbot Gateway site.</p> <p>The SPD sets out at Part 8 that a wide range of supporting technical assessments would be required on a range of issues to support subsequent planning applications and detailed proposals for the phased redevelopment of the Gateway area. It will only be at that stage, in conjunction with the earlier statutory basis provided by the Local Plan and TG SPD, that the necessary basis for the use of CPO powers will be provided.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	No change		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
017	001	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Alan Mitchell	16-Aug-06	16-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Carrillion Richardson Partnership c/o Carrillion Developments			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 5 - Development Character and Part 8 - The Approvals Process			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Major foodstore and Retail Impact Assessment			
Summary of Your Comment			
Paragraph 5.18 refers to the new foodstore requirement at the gateway site. The final sentence is overly restrictive and does not reflect the principles of PPS6.			
Changes Sought			
The following should be added to the end of the paragraph: ".....unless it can be demonstrated that there is a need for the additional comparison floorspace".			
Council's Response			
PPS6 states that in assessing need and capacity greater weight should be placed on assessing the need for specific types of retail development. The 2004 Blackpool Shopping Study identified a clear qualitative need for a large format foodstore with ancillary non-food sales, as the most appropriate means of reversing the marked decline in the town centre's food offer. The Blackpool Local Plan and the SPD para 5.18 reflect this approach, with other than ancillary non-food provision directed to the defined town centre. Further guidance in paras 5.35 to 5.38 is provided with regard to proposed non-food development. It is accepted that further clarification is therefore required to show that this more restrictive approach only applies should the foodstore be located outside the defined town centre.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
Add sentence to end of para 5.18 to state: larger scale store, potentially including non-food provision, would only be permitted if it demonstrates a clear functional relationship focused on that part of the site within the defined town centre (as on Plan 9).			A

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
017	002	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Alan Mitchell	16-Aug-06	16-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Carillion Richardson Partnership c/o Carillion Developments			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 5 - Development Character			
Page no			
-			
Section			
Non-food Stores			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>Paragraphs 5.34-5.38 state that non-food stores would be expected to be located within the part of the site that is included in the town centre and that non-food stores will only be allowed in the edge of centre part of the site if there is need for such floorspace and there are no suitable sites within the town centre. Whilst this reflects the requirements of the Local Plan Adopted Policy SR3, it should be recognised that non-food stores serving the needs of the redeveloped site will be supported and will perform an important role in creating the distinctive, prestige gateway development sought for the area. In order to achieve active frontages and a robust gateway link to the town centre, non-food retail units will need to be located outside the town centre boundary. As currently worded, the paragraphs present a degree of inflexibility and might be in contradiction with pedestrian permeability attempted to be achieved through the Talbot Gateway redevelopment. We feel that the creation of appropriate, active pedestrian frontages leading from the new arrival point into the town centre is pivotal to the success of this development, as indeed is sought in the brief at paragraphs 7.33 and 7.35.</p>			
Changes Sought			
<p>The brief should reflect the above. Suggested amendment to paragraph 5.36: insert the word 'substantial' in the first sentence as follows; "in line with Policy SR3, 'substantial' non-food stores....". Insert the following at the end of the paragraph; "some non-food stores will be permitted outside the town centre boundary where it can be demonstrated that they provide an ancillary function to the core components on the site and will not undermine the town centre. Ancillary non-food stores will contribute to the overall mix of uses on the gateway site and can fulfil an important role in creating a distinctive, prestige development". Suggested amendment to paragraph 5.38: amend the final sentence as follows; "...town centre site. 'Ancillary retail development' 'will also be permitted as part of the overall mix of uses outside the town centre boundary and' as part of any major....".</p>			
Council's Response			
<p>As stated, the more restrictive approach to retail development set out in paras 5.34 - 5.38 reflects the adopted Local Plan Policy SR3, whilst paras 7.33 - 7.34 set out that the Gateway has a vital role to play in providing active pedestrian connection between key arrival points in the town centre. While it is understood that retail development is seen by the objector as one way to provide an active frontage, other measures such as well designed architecture, public spaces, attractive landscaping, seating/ resting areas can all also contribute to a more active character. It is also generally the case that there will be a degree of conflict between different aims and policies of the Local Plan/ SPDs. It is not accepted that there is therefore any justification to expressly state in the SPD that "retail development will be permitted outside the town centre" contrary to the normal application of policy, beyond the statement already set out in para 5.36 - rather it remains the case that the need will be to consider any development proposals for the TG area in their totality against the requirements of the SPD and take a balanced view. Further clarification, however, is proposed will be included in the SPD at para 5.42 regarding ancillary uses to recognise their role generally in adding to the vitality of the Talbot Gateway area. Within the section on non-food retail development (paras 5.35 - 5.38) it is also proposed to clarify that all proposals will be judged on their overall merits.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
Para 5.42 to be amended to state:			In
<p>addition to the main uses identified, it is recognised that restaurants, cafes and other ancillary uses will also perform an integral role serving the needs of the various developments and adding to the vitality of</p>			

the area.

---

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
018	001	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Henryk Peterson	18-Aug-06	21-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Sport England			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 5 - Development Character			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>It is considered that sport and recreation facilities form an integral part of the Blackpool economy. Accessing such facilities within a sub regional centre such as Blackpool via sustainable means of transport can benefit local populations as well as visitors, encouraging increased participation in physical activity and active lifestyles.</p>			
Changes Sought			
<p>The brief should advise the need to: protect /manage opportunities for the advancement of sport, and identify and help the creation of such sites that can accommodate participating visitors in such activities. Please note Sport England's Active Places Power Plus may also be able to identify what sport and recreational facility deficiencies exist and where such needs should be catered for.</p>			
Council's Response			
<p>It is fully accepted that sports and recreation facilities form an integral part of the Blackpool economy. Centrally locating such facilities is also desirable. However, there are a wide range of competing uses that the Council is seeking to accommodate on this already intensively developed Talbot Gateway site.</p> <p>The prime requirements identified in Policy SR3 of the Local Plan and in the SPD focus on its role as a site for a transport interchange, public car parking, a major foodstore, and to provide a new civic and cultural quarter. It is a major issue for the chosen developer to determine how these and a whole host of other potential demands identified in the SPD can be accommodated on the site - all of which, in policy terms, are seen as appropriate and much needed town centre uses.</p> <p>In this context, without disputing the desirability of town centre sports and recreation provision, it is not in policy terms a prime requirement that needs to be met in this specific location. There is also an issue about the viability of such provision and its impact on the wider scheme and the delivery of positive commercial returns to enable high quality, transformational change. Extensive efforts have been made to enhance sports and leisure facilities for a wide range of sites across the Borough. In the context of the wide ranging demands on the Talbot Gateway site, it is not a priority, nor is it a policy requirement, to create enhanced sports and recreation facilities on this site - although there remains the potential within a mixed use redevelopment that new sport and recreation provision such as health and leisure club uses may appropriately come forward as part of the eventual proposals for the area.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
018	002	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Henryk Peterson	18-Aug-06	21-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Sport England			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 5 - Development Character			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>It is noted the draft brief also refers to possible replacement of the existing indoor bowling centre outside the town centre. Such relocation would not appear to accord with government planning policy as per PPS6 or advance the principles of sustainability. Were an out of centre location pursued, the brief would need to refer to acceptance only if the sequential test could be satisfied. Ideally it would be preferable for such a sport and recreational use to continue to locate within easy travel distance of existing transport hub sites.</p>			
Changes Sought			
See above.			
Council's Response			
<p>The Bowls facility is centrally located within the Talbot Gateway site. Its position is such that it would substantially inhibit the redevelopment of the area. The proposed redevelopment of the Gateway was subject to extensive consultation on the Blackpool Local Plan. In response to the objection from Sport England the Inspector in his report on the Local Plan recommended that a replacement facility would need to be provided unless it was shown surplus to requirements or a replacement facility was provided.</p> <p>The future of the Indoor Bowls Hall was considered in a report to the Council's Executive on 28th June 2006. The Executive were given details of current useage and the financial position. In the context of the Council's Leisure Strategy and delivery of leisure services, it was concluded that the club served a small number of Blackpool residents and required council support to continue. It was concluded no replacement provision was required to be made in the TG redevelopment scheme; that revenue monies currently paid to the Club be ring-fenced for use by Leisure Services in developing bowwling; and that indoor bowling be taken into account when considering multi-purpose indoor leisure provision in the North Shore area.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
018	003	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Henryk Peterson	18-Aug-06	21-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Sport England			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 5 - Development Character			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
It is noted that the draft brief advocates increasing the quantity and mix of housing provision, and that developer contributions would be sought for necessary infrastructure provision. Given that the area of concern is highly urbanised, contributions to open space improvement and provision may need to be directed to areas outside the boundary of the brief but within the same catchment.			
Changes Sought			
The brief may wish to make reference to this.			
Council's Response			
It is accepted that developer contributions may need to be directed to improvements outside the TG site. This is provided for through the normal operation of Council planning policy (through Policy BH10 of the Local Plan). Specific reference to open space requirements is set out at para 5.33 of the SPD, but for clarification it is considered direct reference to Policy BH10 should be made and the policy should be added to the list of other key policies set out in Appendix 2 of the SPD			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
Amend para 5.33 to refer to Policy BH10 and add Policy BH10 to the list of key policies in Appendix 2			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
019	001	Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	-	13-Aug-06	13-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lynda Turk			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
The old Talbot Road Bus Station is an unwelcoming, dirty and bleak point of arrival. Toilet facilities are also poorly maintained and unpleasant.			
Changes Sought			
None.			
Council's Response			
The current poor and unwelcoming appearance of the Bus Station is fully accepted as a problem which is sought to be addressed in the SPD			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
None			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
019	002	Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	-	13-Aug-06	13-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Lynda Turk	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	General		
Page no	-		
Section	-		
Summary of Your Comment	Blackpool North Train Station appears run down and quite dirty. Unkempt and rundown buildings do not make places seem very inviting.		
Changes Sought	None.		
Council's Response	The need for a major improvement and potential remodeling of Blackpool North Station is accepted and is sought to be addressed by the SPD.		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	None		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
019	003	Comment	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	-	13-Aug-06	13-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Lynda Turk			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
There is a lack of greenery within the town itself. Trees have environmental advantages and also soften areas of concrete. In my opinion, people are much calmer and less aggressive in such surroundings. Added greenery would certainly enhance the town centre.			
Changes Sought			
None.			
Council's Response			
The point is noted and reflected in the SPD. The need to uplift the TG environment to provide a distinctive identity to the area is a core requirement. In addition to enhancing public space/ outdoor areas, the SPD paras 7.60 -7.61 specifically sets out the need for a robust approach towards soft landscaping to relieve the urban form.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
None			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
020	001	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Philip Mitchell	18-Aug-06	18-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Green Party	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 6 - Access and Accessibility		
Page no	-		
Section	General		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>Although the development is an ideal opportunity to introduce a Green Transport Plan, the proposals do not go far enough to do this. Divert public funding into improved Green transport system designed to encourage public transport instead of cars and significantly reduce town centre parking in line with this. The proposed redevelopment provides an excellent opportunity to build-in good cycling provision from the outset. Clearly marked cycle lanes and more places to securely lock bikes are needed. The objective must be to reduce air quality impacts and hence traffic volume significantly to bring air quality to safe levels for the resident population.</p>		
Changes Sought	See above.		
Council's Response	<p>The developers will be required to institute a Travel Plan within the planning approval process and will also have to demonstrate how air quality will be improved in the Talbot Gateway area. The brief addresses the need to provide facilities for cyclists, including parking, and developers will be expected to provide such facilities within their proposals:</p> <p>Para 6.40: Public cycle parking should additionally be provided within or at locations close to the access points for all uses within the site. Measures to encourage cycling by employees should be incorporated into the Travel Plan.</p> <p>The brief does not propose that off-road cycle facilities are provided within the development, a highway based solution being favoured instead.</p> <p>Blackpool's Local Transport Plan promotes public transport, walking and cycling for commuting and utility journeys and resources are made available on a priority basis to support this policy.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	No change		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
020	002	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Philip Mitchell	18-Aug-06	18-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Green Party	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	Major Food Store		
Summary of Your Comment	There is too great an emphasis on a "major foodstore" whereas local shops and markets need support in the plans.		
Changes Sought	Incorporate into the design an area to encourage a local Farmer's Market and reduce capacity of Foodstore to give preference to Farmer's Market and existing food shops in the catchment area. This will benefit the local economy rather than the non-localised products of a major foodstore chain and have a lower impact on climate change due to reduced foodstuff transport.		
Council's Response	The Blackpool Shopping Study in 2004 highlighted the deficiencies in town centre food shopping and identified a clear need for a major foodstore in or on the edge of centre, with the TG site recommended as the most appropriate location for such a foodstore. The Council's Local Plan fully recognises the importance of smaller local shops and markets, but such provision is more appropriately located within the defined town centre, rather than on the TG site. The overall aim is for an enhanced mix of quality shops, providing a complementary and comprehensive range of facilities to meet residents needs.		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	No change		

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
020	003	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Philip Mitchell	18-Aug-06	18-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Green Party			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 7 - Design Parameters and Principles			
Page no			
-			
Section			
General			
Summary of Your Comment			
A 24hr character of the development would increase anti-social behaviour, and cause particular problems in the adjoining residential areas. A 24hr character of a Gateway and mixed use development of this size is unacceptable without indisputable evidence that this will not increase evening and night-time levels of anti-social behaviour.			
Changes Sought			
See above.			
Council's Response			
The issue of 24-hour use was raised to ensure that anyone accessing this area at whatever time feels fundamentally safe within the space. The cultural emphasis placed on this area implies that a number of uses may potentially introduce an active evening character that would be important in complementing the civic scale and character of the space, providing much needed animation in terms of eyes on the street and increased safety.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
Replace para 7.71 with. `Community safety issues will need to be considered from the outset of the design process to ensure that the spaces and routes created are perceptibly and actually safe at whatever time they area used, with uses on site being disposed and arranged to support active/passive surveillance of the public realm.			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
020	004	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	Philip Mitchell	18-Aug-06	18-Aug-06
Respondent	Agent		
Green Party	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Part	Part 5 - Development Character		
Page no	-		
Section	General		
Summary of Your Comment	<p>Small hotels and boarding houses should remain the backbone of Blackpool's holiday accommodation industry. As Blackpool's small hotels are currently underutilised, it is unlikely that a Hotel assessment can justify a new hotel on this site.</p>		
Changes Sought	See above.		
Council's Response	<p>The Council's Local Plan seeks to safeguard existing holiday accommodation areas wherever current levels of visitor demand continue to support such use. The change of use or redevelopment of holiday accommodation is only permitted in those areas where such use is no longer viable.</p> <p>A main thrust of the resort regeneration strategy is to provide enhanced major attractions and facilities so as to continue to support the holiday accommodation sector and increase visitor numbers. In conjunction with improved attractions the need is also for improved quality of Blackpool's holiday accommodation offer to meet visitors ever rising expectations. The need is for a range of accommodation to meet needs - both new provision and a continued improvement in the quality of existing stock.</p> <p>The identification of hotel development as an acceptable use within the TG area recognises that such provision could be appropriate as part of the redevelopment of this key transport gateway, including a potential major remodeling of Blackpool North station. Part 8 of the SPD sets out that any proposed new provision will need to be underpinned by a hotel assessment which justifies the number and quality of bed-spaces and demonstrates its contribution to wider resort regeneration.</p>		
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief	No change		

Respondent No                      Comment No                      Type

020                                      005                                      Objection

Policy                                      Name                                      Date sent                      Date rec'd

-                                      Philip Mitchell                      18-Aug-06                      18-Aug-06

Respondent                                      Agent

Green Party                                     

Part

Part 5 - Development Character

Page no

-

Section

Civic and Cultural Quarter

Summary of Your Comment

Additional funding to support the proposals made by the Green Party could be found if the necessity to build a new Civic and Cultural Quarter was reconsidered.

Changes Sought

See above.

Council's Response

The proposal for a new civic and cultural quarter is a core component of the TG redevelopment. The Talbot Gateway is a sustainable location for increased office provision which will reduce travel needs, encourage more sustainable travel to work, and help support the wider health and vitality of the town centre.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
021	001	Support	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	-	14-Jul-06	14-Jul-06
Respondent			Agent
Mr. Peter O'Dea			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
General			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
General support. When will you be informing the owners of the affected properties about compensation for compulsory purchase? I own numbers 16 and 18 Caunce Street which are inside the Talbot Gateway development.			
Changes Sought			
None.			
Council's Response			
<p>The Talbot Gateway site has been identified in the Council's adopted Local Plan as one of the town's key edge of centre redevelopment sites. The purpose of the SPD is to provide more detailed policy guidance to secure comprehensive redevelopment proposals for the Talbot Gateway. There are no current proposals for the properties on Caunce Street which are unlikely to be included in any redevelopment proposals in the short term, with the focus of any first phase redevelopment likely to be elsewhere in the Gateway.</p> <p>Precisely what areas/ buildings may be included in any eventual redevelopment proposals is not determined by the SPD and will only be determined subsequently as part of the eventual preparation of detailed development proposals by the Council's eventual selected developer partner. Planning applications for any first phase redevelopment proposals, together with an overall concept masterplan for the area will be expected to be prepared later in 2007. A clear relocation strategy that assesses how existing uses within the site are affected by any redevelopment proposals will be required as part of any such proposals produced for the area.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
In response to this and other representations it is proposed additional reference should be included in Part 8 of the Brief requiring a clear "relocation strategy" that assesses existing uses within the site, to be part and parcel of the proposals to be produced by the Council's eventual selected developer partner for the area.			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
022	001	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	E. V. Smith	14-Aug-06	14-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
Blackpool and Fylde Rail Users Association	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

Part 6 - Access and Accessibility
-----------------------------------

Page no

-
---

Section

-
---

Summary of Your Comment

BAFRUA endorses the concept of an open pedestrian area having level access to the transport interchange facilities, giving a much more attractive picture of the town on arrival.
---

Changes Sought

None.
-------

Council's Response

Support noted
---------------

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

None
------

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
022	002	Comment

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	E. V. Smith	14-Aug-06	14-Aug-06

Respondent Agent   
Blackpool and Fylde Rail Users Association

Part  
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility

Page no  
-

Section  
-

Summary of Your Comment  
We would welcome any greater provision of bus services into or very close to the station forecourt.

Changes Sought  
None.

Council's Response  
Support noted

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief  
None

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
022	003	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	E. V. Smith	14-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Blackpool and Fylde Rail Users Association			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
<p>We wish to be sure that the proposed distributor road does not create any greater separation of the railway station from other nodes than now. The present height difference between the rail track level and adjacent roads tends to hide the station, when approaching from the seaward end of Talbot Road; that height may have to be crossed by escalator or moving walkway to give better access to the level pedestrian area.</p>			
Changes Sought			
See above.			
Council's Response			
<p>This issue is recognised; the railway station will benefit from improved visibility and access. The brief addresses this in the following:</p> <p>Para 6.19: The key pedestrian route in need of improvement is that to and from the railway station, east-west along Talbot Road towards the Town Centre and the Promenade. This will require measures to reduce severance by the high-capacity TCDR north-south route in the High Street/Talbot Road area – potentially taking advantage of the local topography to achieve grade separation.</p> <p>The brief goes on to say:</p> <p>Para 6.26: The Council would therefore support a major remodelling of Blackpool North station as part of the Gateway redevelopment. Remodelling of the terminal building and forecourt areas also has potential to help secure and facilitate wider redevelopment in adjacent areas, including the isolated Banks Street car park.</p>			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			
No change			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
022	004	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	E. V. Smith	14-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Blackpool and Fylde Rail Users Association			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
There should be no attempt to reduce the number of rail tracks/platforms in use now, but the railway operator may wish to claim some land in the overall gateway to allow better access to the platforms for trains and passengers.			
Changes Sought			
See above.			
Council's Response			
Platform numbers and their operation are beyond the brief's scope and are the responsibility of Network Rail in partnership with the train operating companies. Blackpool North station's role as a gateway to Blackpool and rail's under exploited potential to bring people to Blackpool sustainably is recognised. The brief aspires to improve access to the station, its surrounding environment and to encourage its expanding use.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			

Respondent No	Comment No	Type	
022	005	Objection	
Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	E. V. Smith	14-Aug-06	14-Aug-06
Respondent			Agent
Blackpool and Fylde Rail Users Association			<input type="checkbox"/>
Part			
Part 6 - Access and Accessibility			
Page no			
-			
Section			
-			
Summary of Your Comment			
We suggest that Banks Street should not be used as a coach park, and should be dedicated to use by local residents, visitors to local hotels, rail station staff, and an expanded facility for rail users, with a walkway onto the concourse.			
Changes Sought			
See above.			
Council's Response			
There are no immediate plans to use this land as a coach park. However, the need to provide coach parking for the resort is recognised and this will continue to be considered within the overall development process. The brief aspires to facilitate better coach access in order to promote coach access to Blackpool. The future of Banks Street car park itself is not determined by the Brief, but will only be determined subsequently as part of the eventual preparation of detailed development proposals by the Council's selected developer partner.			
Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief			



Respondent No	Comment No	Type
023	001	Support

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	-	13-Jul-06	14-Jul-06

Respondent	Agent
Mrs. June Preisner	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

General
---------

Page no

-
---

Section

-
---

Summary of Your Comment

I feel the plan will be a good thing for Blackpool and I am particularly pleased about a major foodstore to give more choice in purchasing. The small local shops are good in their way but selection is very basic. My opinion is, a good thing all round.
---

Changes Sought

None.
-------

Council's Response

Support noted
---------------

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

None
------

Respondent No	Comment No	Type
024	001	Comment

Policy	Name	Date sent	Date rec'd
-	-	18-Aug-06	22-Aug-06

Respondent	Agent
Mrs. Jean Senventi	<input type="checkbox"/>

Part

General
---------

Page no

-
---

Section

-
---

Summary of Your Comment

The respondent is concerned about the state of the Buchanan Street properties for the following reasons: (a) they are an eyesore and devalue other properties; (b) they are in a poor state of disrepair; (c) they are potentially used by squatters; (d) the rears of the properties are a dumping ground for rubbish, some of it potentially dangerous; (e) information regarding plans for the properties is lacking; (f) the area is intimidating.

Changes Sought

Removal/improvement of the Buchanan Street properties.

Council's Response

The Council has actively sought to acquire these properties but demolition cannot take place until all the properties in individual blocks are purchased. The intention is for the demolition of properties on Buchanan Street as soon as possible once all the properties are acquired. In the interim it is recognised there are amenity issues, with the Council's priority to safeguard and secure the properties to minimise problems.

Proposed Change to Revised Draft Planning Brief

No change

## **APPENDIX B**

### **TALBOT GATEWAY PLANNING BRIEF**

#### **OTHER RECOMMENDED CHANGES TO UPDATE THE REPORT**

- 1 There are a number of amendments required to update the document following the adoption of the Local Plan in June 2006. These largely result from the renumbering of the policies in the final adopted Plan.
- 2 There are numerous amendments to make to remove reference to the fact that the earlier SPD was a draft document, including references to the ongoing consultation process.
- 3 There are a small number of other amendments appropriate to update factual information resulting from changes that have occurred on the progress of developments affecting the area.

It is not considered appropriate or necessary to list all such changes in detail, but the final recommendation to Executive is:

- To give delegated authority to officers to prepare the final Talbot Gateway SPD incorporating the approved changes and any further minor changes and corrections that do not affect the substance of the detailed policy guidance.

The Council believes in access for all.

To ensure services provided by Blackpool Council are accessible, information is available upon request in a variety of accessible formats, including large print, Braille, on audio-cassette or computer disc.

We can also provide help for British Sign Language users and provide information in languages other than English.

Please ask for details.

Customer First telephone number: 01253 477 477